

The Classical Review

APRIL 1897.

THE MINOR WORKS OF XENOPHON.

(Continued from p. 21.)

VI., VII. THE CONSTITUTIONS.

IN dealing with the two *Constitutions* that have come down to us under the name of Xenophon, I shall not enter upon a general discussion of all the grounds for asserting or impugning the genuineness of either of them. So far as these grounds consist in the matter of the two works, they have been very fully discussed, and I at any rate am not capable of adducing any fresh argument. I wish however to submit the language in which they are written to a somewhat closer scrutiny than it has as yet received, and to see what conclusions, if any, can be drawn from it as to the questions of probable date and authorship. It will be best to begin with the *Respublica Lacædæmoniorum* and to go on subsequently to the *Respublica Atheniensium*. After discussing in both cases the language and any inferences that may be drawn from it, I shall offer a few suggestions on particular passages.

F. Haase's edition of the *R.L.* (1833) contains some remarks on the diction and a discriminating verbal index. Cobet in the *Novæ Lectiones* (1858) pointed out two or three things as regards the language, especially a few more or less technical Spartan terms. He had on further study changed his mind as to the authorship (Preface, p. xxiv.) and had satisfied himself that the *R.L.* was a genuine work of X. He

NO. XCV. VOL. XI.

relies however mainly on some things in the contents of the book, and his observations on the language, weighty as anything of Cobet's on such a subject must be, are very slight. In *Xenophontis Opuscula Politica Equestris et Venatica* (Oxford, 1866) L. Dindorf points out certain words and constructions which in his opinion tell against X.'s authorship. E. Naumann (*De Xenophontis libro qui Lacædæmoniorum Πολιτεία inscribitur*: Berlin, 1876) and H. Bazin (*La République des Lacédémoniens de Xénophon*: Paris, 1885) examine the language with some care and come to a conclusion opposite to Dindorf's.

Useful as is the work which these writers have done, it is not unfair to say that they have left untouched a large, perhaps the larger, part of the material available. More particularly they have taken little notice of various points of grammatical usage, which are of great importance in an inquiry like this, such as certain uses of conjunctions and other small but frequent words. To a considerable proportion of the facts now to be stated attention has not, to the best of my belief, hitherto been called. No doubt there are more which could be added. My list has no pretensions to be complete, and I shall be quite satisfied if the statements in it are correct as far as they go. With our present insufficient supply of trustworthy indexes and lexicons to particular authors it is not easy to make sure of one's

M

facts. Sturz's *Lexicon Xenophonticum* (1801-1804), though old, has been very useful: from Sauppe's *Lexilogus Xenophonticus* (1869) I have not got as much assistance as I hoped. When Joost has followed up his study of the *Anabasis* (*Was ergibt sich aus dem Sprachgebrauch Xenophon's in der Anabasis für die Behandlung der griechischen Syntax in der Schule?* Berlin, 1892) by similar studies of the other larger works, our resources for dealing with a question like the present will be considerably increased.

In the first place let us notice that the use of final conjunctions in the *R.L.* is quite in accordance with the practice of X. (see Goodwin's *M. and T.* espec. Appendix iii. and iv.). Final *ὥς*, which is almost peculiar to him among Attic prose-writers, occurs three times (2, 6: 13, 1: 15, 5): *ὅπως* seven times, and *ἵνα* four. Weber has shown that in most of the works of X. *ὥς* and *ὅπως* together are used more freely than *ἵνα*, the conjunction common in Aristophanes, Plato, and the orators. The unattic use of *ὥς* and *ὥς ἂν* with 'object clauses' after *ἐπιμελείσθαι* etc. occurs 3, 3: 6, 1: 14, 4. X. has a third frequent but unattic use of *ὥς*, the use = *ὥστε*, which we find in Herodotus and Hippocrates with the infinitive and sometimes with the indicative. (In Herodotus Cobet has altered infinitive to indicative quite needlessly). This use is found in the *R.L.* 5, 3 and 8: 11, 6 etc., and Madvig has no reason whatever for altering the *ὥς* in 5, 8 to *ὥστε*. Very characteristic of X. is the Herodotean and unattic use of *ἐσσε* for *ἔως* in both senses, 'while' and 'until.' Goodwin (§ 617) says 'in Attic prose (especially in X.),' but is it ever used in Attic prose except by X.? It occurs here 11, 8 and 9. The temporal use of *ἐπεὶ*, which is, I imagine, quite uncommon in the orators, who use *ἐπαδὴ* instead, though frequent enough in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, will be found in 1, 1 and 5 and 2, 1. *ἔρθα* 'where,' used when a writer of pure Attic prose would put *οὐ*, *ὅπου*, *ἵνα*, or—Demosthenes, for instance, does not use *ἔρθα* once, nor does Lysias—occurs 3, 4: 5, 7 etc. This use is constant in X. The adverbial *ῆ* of manner (9, 3: 10, 1 etc.) is much commoner in X. than in the orators. The phrase in 1, 3 *σὶ τῷ ῆ ἀνυστὸν μετρωτάτω* is thus doubly Xn., for *ἀνυστὸν* is not a word of ordinary Attic, but occurs *Anab.* 1, 8, 11 in the similar phrase *σὶ γῇ ὥς ἀνυστὸν . . προσῆσαν*. It has been pretty well known since 1874, when Tycho Mommsen published his figures, that X. differs from all Attic prose-writers in preferring *σύν* to *μετά*.

Thus, according to Mommsen, in Thucydides *σύν* occurs only 37 times, and *μετά* with a genitive 400, but in X. *μετά* with a genitive occurs 275 times, and *σύν* 556. In the *R.L.* *σύν* will be found in 8, 5: 13, 1 and 2: *μετά* I think only in 11, 7. The preposition *ἀμφί* = *περί* is well known to be characteristic of X., and so is the phrase *τὰ ἀμφί τι*: we have here in 7, 2 *τὰ ἀμφί χρηματισμόν*. X. several times uses *παρά* in the sense of 'close to,' 'alongside of,' etc. with verbs of rest, e.g. *de Re Eq.* 8, 12 *ἔως μὲν ἂν παρὰ τοῖς φίλοις τις ῆ*: *Cyr.* 1, 4, 18 *ἔπειν αὐτῷ μένειν παρ' ἐαυτὸν*: we have here in 12, 2 *φυλακὰς γε μὴν ἐποίησε μεθήμενὰς τὰς μὲν παρὰ τὰ ὅπλα εἰσω βλεπούσας*. *Πρόσθεν*, which X. uses very often instead of the more usual Attic *ἐμπροσθεν*, occurs in 13, 6. (Cobet, *N.L.* p. 688, when he altered *πρόσθεν* in *Mem.* 1, 4, 6 to *ἐμπροσθεν*, had perhaps not noticed X.'s practice. *Πρόσθεν* is the older word, as appears from *ἐμπροσθεν* not occurring in Homer, and from there being no phrase *ἐμπροσθεν* . . *πρὶν* κ.τ.λ. We may doubt whether *τοῦμπροσθεν* is right in Eur. *Hipp.* 1228, since it seems to be the only place in tragedy where *ἐμπροσθεν* is found). Throughout the treatise the Xn. *γε μὴν* is of very frequent occurrence: *καί—δέ*, which is also very common in X. and by no means equally so in all prose-writers, occurs a dozen times, and the double *τε*, rare in Attic prose but used sometimes by X., may be found in 1, 9. In other respects too the statistics given by Roquette (*De Xenophontis Vita*, p. 39), who takes no notice of *καί—δέ*, seem to show that the use of particles is thoroughly Xn.

Very many other words may be found in the *R.L.* which belong to the peculiar vocabulary of X. In 12, 5 *μάσσω* has been restored for *ἐλάσσω*, just as in *Cyr.* 2, 4, 27 *μάσσω* was corrected to *ἐλάσσω* by L. Dindorf following Suidas s.v. *μάσσω*. X. also uses the unattic *μίκιστος*. *Μείων* (= *ἥττων* or *ἐλάττω*) and *μειονεκτείν*, *μειονεξία* are thoroughly Xn.; these words occur 9, 1: 11, 9. *Κρατύνω* (2, 3), *ἀρήγω* (4, 5), *πεπαμένος* (6, 4), *κατάρχω* (8, 2), *σύνομαι* (12, 5), are verbs which occur seldom or never in ordinary Attic, but they may be found in X., *ἀρήγω* constantly. Such too are *ἐρευνῶ* (7, 6), a Platonic word hardly used in common language, and *ἐπικουρῶ* (2, 6 etc.) which seems to occur only once in an orator. *Ἐπομαι* (8, 2 etc.) is avoided by the orators, very frequent in X. and not rare in Plato. *Κλωπεύω* (2, 7) is used in *Anab.* 6, 1, 1. *Ῥαδιουργῶ* and *Ῥαδιουργία* (2, 2 and 14, 4) are regular Xn. words, but occur nowhere in the orators nor in Plato, once in a fragment

of the New Comedy, and once in a pseudo-Aristotelian work. Βλακεύω (2, 9) is hardly found in other Attic writers, but X. is fond of it and kindred words. The same may be said of μεγαλύνομαι (8, 2). The uses of ἀποδεικνύειν = 'ordain' (10, 7), of διαπράττειν (2, 10) and κατεργάζεσθαι (9, 1), all with accusative and infinitive, may be paralleled from other Xn. writings, but hardly elsewhere. Πληγὰς ἐμβάλλειν (6, 2) seems not to be found out of X.

X.'s favourite and peculiar use of ἰσχυρῶς = πάνν, σφόδρα etc., occurs in 2, 2 and 3, 4. Μεγάλως, which is used occasionally by X. and Plato but not by the orators, occurs in 10, 4. Πάμπαν, unknown to Thucydides, to the orators, and except for one Aristophanic hexameter (*Peace* 121) to the comic poets, occurs in 1, 3 and elsewhere in X., as it does now and then in Plato. Ὠσαύτως (6, 3) may be described in almost the same terms (three or four times in Demosthenes). Πυκνά = πολλάκις may be found in 12, 5 and elsewhere in X. Τῷ παντί (8, 5), with comparatives and similar expressions is thoroughly Xn. The use of ὅσα in 5, 7 τῇ ὄρῃ ὅσα ἡμέρα χρηστέων is found in *Hell.* 6, 1, 15: *Cyr.* 1, 5, 12. Εὐφροσύνη is a substantive known to us chiefly from Homer and other poets, but X. is addicted to the use of it, and we have it here in 7, 6. Τέκνα for παῖδες occurs in 1, 8 and τεκνοποιεῖσθαι, τεκνοτομία, εὐτεκος in the same chapter: Thucydides, the orators and even Plato avoid using τέκνον: Aristophanes has it only in burlesque or in touches of real poetry; but X. uses it very often.

Finally I believe that the following words of various kinds, though not confined in use to the works of X., will be recognised as belonging more or less to his vocabulary by those who have given attention to it: διαθρύπτω (2, 1), μεγαλείως (4, 6), ἤλιξ (5, 5), ἄφοδος (5, 7), ἡδυπάθεια (7, 3), ὁμογνώμων (8, 1), κακοδαιμονία (9, 3), καλοκάγαθία (10, 1), ἀνυπόστατος (10, 7), σχολαί(ό)τατα (11, 3), γοργός (11, 3), παρεγγύσεις (11, 4: X. does not use this word elsewhere, but he has παρεγγυᾶν constantly and παρεγγύη *Anab.* 6, 5, 13: παραγγέλλω, παραγγελία are the ordinary Attic); ἐθελούσιος (13, 7), ὑπερφέρειν (15, 3 and 8).

If now, looking to the other side of the argument, we ask whether there is anything in the language which tells strongly against X.'s authorship, the question may in spite of Dindorf be answered confidently in the negative. In 1, 5 σφῶν αὐτῶν = ἀλλήλων, and as far as Sturz's lexicon shows, there is no other certain instance of this use in

X. Two words seem to be of late date, μεираκιόσθαι (3, 1) and ἐμφυσῶσαι (3, 4), but the quotation in Stobaeus gives us ἐμφύσαι for the second, and εἰς τὸ μεираκιόσθαι is probably a later addition to ἐκ παίδων ἐκβαίνωσι. In 8, 4 ἱκανοί (= κύριοι) εἰσι ζημοῖν may be a mistake: so perhaps is the odd phrase εἰς τὰ ἴσχατα μάλα σοφός in 1, 2. Πάνειν ἀπό τινος (3, 1) is at least unusual (cf. ἐκ and ἀπό with ἀπαλλάττειν, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι) and so are the phrases οἱ ἐκ δημοσίου (3, 3) and ἐπὶ πόλεως (11, 2), the use of περὶ of time in 4, 7 τοῖς τὴν ἡβητικὴν ἡλικίαν πεπερακόσιν, and the use of καὶ μὴν after τε, if right, in 5, 7. Κατεστάθη (15, 1) is not a common form, but it occurs (ἐστάθη) in *Hell.* 3, 1, 9: 5, 2, 43 as well as in the orators (Veitch, who does not cite this passage). With τῶν δεομένων γίνεσθαι (13, 7) compare *Cyr.* 2, 3, 3 τῶν πράττεσθαι δεομένων. All these points are very trifling.

There are a fair number of words that occur perhaps nowhere else in X., but this is in no way surprising. Each of his works taken separately presents words of which the same may be said, and not one of the words in the *R. L.* except μεираκιόσθαι and ἐμφυσῶσαι need give rise to any suspicion. A few of them (συσκίνητα, ἀστυφίλικτος, ἐπὶ φρονῆς, etc.) are, as Cobet pointed out, technical Spartan terms, quite natural in this treatise. Some again belong to the class most characteristic of X., that are otherwise known to us only or mainly from their use in the poets, though no doubt it was not from the poets that they were taken by X. the traveller, the Athenian who lived with Ionians and Dorians of various communities. Such are ἔκγονα (1, 4): γεραίός (1, 7: γεραίτεροι is frequent in X.): ἀναθρώσκω (2, 3, found in Herodotus): ραδινός (2, 6): ὄρῃ (5, 7: ὄρφινος used of colour *Cyr.* 8, 3, 3): ἐπὶ κληροῖς (9, 4: Herodotus and Thucydides): τέρμα (10, 1: used literally *Cyr.* 8, 3, 25): ἐκτελεῖν (10, 7): ἀραιός (11, 6): κνεφαῖος (13, 3: κνεφας in *Anab.* 4, 5, 9 and elsewhere): λῆις = λεία (13, 11): ἐπιψογος (14, 7. cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 611, where it is active in meaning). Τορός (2, 11) is another word, partly of the same kind. Cobet had no need to alter τὸν τορώτατον ('the smartest') τῶν εἰρηνῶν to τὸν πρεσβύτατον, as is shown by Plat. *Theat.* 175 E τορῶς τε καὶ ὀξέως διακονεῖν and Ar. *Ran.* 1102 κἀπερεῖδεσθαι τορῶς. Διάκορος (1, 5) used by Herodotus and in the form διακορῆς by Plato, is just such a word as we should expect to find in X. Εὐχερής, εὐχέρεια are not used by him elsewhere, but εὐχερέστερον is not at all strange in 2, 5 and Aristotle *H. A.* 8, 6, 2

offers an exact parallel for the sense in which it is used. So *ῥυπαίνεται* (11, 3) is paralleled by *ῥυπαίνουσι* Ar. *Eth.* 1, 8, 1099b 2, and the adjectival *παράλογος* (5, 3) occurs several times in Aristotle (*παράλογος* the adverb in Demosthenes). X, and Aristotle often have words in common. *Ἀποκαθιστάναι* 'restore' (6, 3) seems to occur elsewhere only in late authors, but this may be accidental and is the case with many Thucydidean words. The very curious use of *νομίζω* (1, 7: 2, 4: 12, 3) hereafter to be noticed, should be mentioned here.

There is one more argument from the language which should not be left out of account, and which tells, if not for, at any rate not against Xn. authorship. This is the argument from hiatus. It is well known that in this matter the rules by which many writers and speakers of the fourth century bound themselves with various degrees of strictness were not recognised by X. any more than by Thucydides, though Benseler (*De Hiatu* p. 197) makes a partial exception with regard to the first two chapters of the *Memorabilia*. The writer of the *R. L.* also disregards them altogether. This is far from constituting an argument in X's favour: but perhaps we may say that, if the *R. L.* had been of later date, there is a greater likelihood that some care would have been taken to avoid hiatus. One theory of the authorship at any rate seems to be discredited by this observation,

namely the theory of Lehmann, who attributes the work to a pupil of Isocrates. No pupil of Isocrates is likely to have been so careless of hiatus as this writer shows himself, nor indeed so indiscriminate in his vocabulary, a matter about which Isocrates was very particular.

Although then Dindorf ventured to say that the whole style was *eiusmodi ut, quo magis quis assuetus sit Xenophonti, eo minus eum sit in hoc libro agnitus*, the considerations here adduced will probably be allowed to be very much in favour of the traditional view that the *R. L.* is the genuine work of X. and that it is so throughout. There is not in the language any sign of patchwork and the intrusion of a later hand. The words on which I have laid stress occur in all parts of the treatise: there is no chapter in which some of them may not be found. Even the fourteenth, on which especial doubt has been thrown and which seems to be at least out of its proper place, presents an instance of final *ὥς* and of two more or less noticeable Xn. words (*πρόσθεν* twice and *ῥαδιουργία*). It would be quite consistent with these facts to hold that the treatise is incomplete, a mere fragment or fragments of what X. wrote or perhaps meant to write, but they go very much against the view that we have in it the work of anyone but X. himself.

H. RICHARDS.

(To be continued.)

GREEK METRICAL INSCRIPTIONS FROM PHRYGIA.

(Continued from page 32.)

VI.

Found at Doghan Arslan, near Spore of the Prejennisais.

εἰςβαι[?]ων οἶμος πολυ[π]ειρ[ῆ]τοι[ο] [eis.
κλειυθου
ἡλυθες ἀ[μ]φὶ κ[]όρης [σ]ώματος ἰδρο-
σύνας,
τέρπει δ' ἀψίδεσσι πολυτροχά[λ]οις ἐνὶ
κέντρ[οι]ς
5 ἄντυγος αἰθερέης τείρεσι λαμπομέναις,
ἡελίω τ' ἀνὰ μέσσα πολυ[φ]ειργεί τε σελήνῃ,
ἐξ ὧν δὴ πάντων ἐστι βίος μερόπων.
ἐν ταύτο[ι]ς φύεται τρέφεται γήρα τε τελείται
ζωῆς κ(αι) θανάτου κληῖρος ἐν οἷς
πέλεται.
10 τῷδε μαθημοσύνης Ἐπιτύνηαν ἴδριν ἐόντα,

πνοιῆς δ' ἀ[π]λάνκτους εἰδῶτα μαντο-
σύνας,
θέσφατά τ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἀληθέα φημίζοντα
ὄντων μέλλοντων ἐσσομένων πρότερον.
ἄστεσι δ' ἐν πολλοῖσιν ἰθαγενέων λάχε
τειμάς,
15 λείψας κ(αι) κούρους οὐδὲν ἀφανροτέ-
ρους.
σφῇ δ' ἀρετῇ κ(αι) μέτρα δαείς κ(αι) πείρατα
κόσμου
εἰς ὄρ(φ)νην ἰκόμην πᾶσιν ὀφειλομένην.

This is the imperfect epitaph of an astrologer, by name Epitynchanos (v. 10), whose sons carried on the profession after his death (v. 15). [This Epitynchanos, citizen of many cities (v. 14), is probably the same person who acted as High-priest at Akmonia,

and as an agent in the persecution of Diocletian and his successor. He and his family are described in a remarkable inscription, dated A.D. 315, which is published in my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ii. p. 566, No. 467.' W. M. R.]

Of new words the inscription contains the following:—*πολυπείρητος* (2), *ιδροσύνη* (3), and *μαθημοσύνη* (10)—the compound *πολυμαθημοσύνη* occurs. 3. Note the change of persons, very often found in such inscriptions. Here first person speaks: the third in v. 4 ff., while the first person is resumed in 16-17. 4-5. Tr. 'And at their much-revolving centres he takes his joy with (heaven's) vaults, (which are) studded with constellations of aery orbit.' *τέρπει*: in middle sense = *τέρπεται*; perhaps a solitary instance of this use. The expression *πολυτρόγαλοι ἀγοραί* is found in Christodorus (i.e. *Anthol. Pal.* ii. 15); = *contiones mobiles* (H. Grotius). *κέντρον* in this sense is found in Manetho's *Apotelesmatica* (*passim*). Manetho has also the adjectives *ἀκεντρος*, *ἀπόκεντρος*, *ἐπίκεντρος*. 6. The long *υ* in *πολυφ.* is noteworthy. 10. The sudden change to the acc. is frequent on such stones. Other names got from *τύχη*, *τυγχάνω*, are *Εὐτυχος*, *Σύντυχος*, *Συντύχη*, etc. (see Pape-Benseler). 11. *εἰδὸτα μαντοσύνας* = *ἰδμόνα μαντοσυνάνων* (Manetho, *Apotelesm.* iii. 317). 12-13. Take *πρότερον* closely with *φημίζοντα*. 15. *λείψας*: Veitch has exx. of this aorist. *οὐδὲν ἀφανροτέρους*: perhaps an echo of Aratus, *Phaenom.* 227, *οὐδὲν ἀφανρότερον*. 16. For *σφή* = *ἐμῇ* cf. Monro, *Homeric Grammar* § 255 (2). 17. *ἰκόμην*: note the short *ι*.

VII.

In stone-cutter's yard at Kutaya: brought from Kara Agatch Euren.

Τὸν πάσης ἀρετῆς κέ ἐν ἀνδράσι κῶδος
ἔχοντα
Μοντανὸν—καθορᾶς—κατέχει, ξένε, οὗτος
ὁ τύνβος,
τὸν πατρίδος προνοοῦντα, πᾶσιν πεφιλμέ-
νον ἄνδρα,
Μοντανὸν, στέφανον πατρίδος, βουλευτῶν
γένος ἐν πρώτοις,
5 ἐνδόξων γονέων Κυρίλλου τε πατρὸς
Πρόκλης τε τεκούσης,
τὸν καὶ πᾶσα πατρίς ποθ[ε]ι 'Α(μ)μία τε
σύννευος,
ὃν προέπεινψε πατρίς [γ]αία δῆμοί τε
τοσοῦτοι,
κλαίοντες μέγαν ἄνδρα εἰς 'Αἶδαο περῶντα.
εἰ τις τῆσδε γλυφῆς δολίας χ[ε]ῖρας προσ-
ενεκ[ε]ῖ,

10 ἄτεκνος ἀτυμβος ἀνανχίστεντος ὁλ[ε]ῖται
[δ]ν κέ τέκνα ποθητὰ τιμῆς μεγάλης
προέπεινψαν.

Αὐρ. Μεσσαλίνος κέ Μοντανὸς κέ Ζωτικὸς κέ
'Αντέρως

κέ Πρόκλα γονεῦσιν μνήμης χάριν ἱδρυσαν.

2. Μοντανὸν may be governed by *καθορᾶς*: if so, *κατέχει* must govern αὐτὸν understood. M. seems to have been a common name in Phrygia; see s.v. Montanus (the heretic), in Smith's *Dict. Chr. Biogr.* *κατέχει*: a *vox propria* of the tomb. 3. The α of *πᾶσιν* must be scanned short. Other anomalies in quantity are:—Κυρίλλον (5); 'Α(μ)μία (6); γαία (7), if so written, but I have given in the text the form γαία, which co-existed by the side of the usual γαῖα; εἰς (8), where the engraver may have intended to write the form ἐς; 'Αἶδαο (8); ἄτεκνος and ἀτυμβος (10); κέ (11) as compared with κέ (1); τῆς (11). 4. The metre is lost altogether after *βουλευτῶν*. *στεφ. πατρ.* an expression quite natural, as applied to a person, to which I can find no parallel. 5. Has a foot extra. 6. *πᾶσα πατρίς* 'his whole fatherland.' 7. Citizens of many cities followed him to the grave. 9. *γλυφῆς* refers to the bas-relief on the tomb-stone, representing the deceased Montanus. The clause *εἰ τις . . . προσεπενεκεῖ* is usually followed in inscriptions of Eumeneia, not by an imprecation, as here, but by mention of a fine payable to the fiscus, or some other public institution: see the abundant testimony in Ramsay's *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, chap. x., App. 1. 10. *ἀνανχίστεντος* (a word not given by Liddell and Scott) = without ἀγχιστεῖς, or 'next of kin,' to keep up the family *sacra* (Meier and Schömann's *Attische Process*, by Lipsius p. 581 ff.). 11. *τιμ. μεγ.* 'at great expense.' 12. Αὐρ. (cf. i. 1) = Αἰρήλιος, a frequent *praenomen* in the second century, and later, derived from the gens name of the Antonines. 13. *γονεῦσιν*, plural, though there is no mention of the mother previously.

VIII.

τὸν θεὸν σοὶ (i.e. σὺν) μὴ ἀδικαίσις (i.e. ἀδικήσεις)

Open *tubellae* or *codex*.

Ἀμμία κέ Κυρίλλα[s]
κέ Ταττιανῆς

Ἀέναον τόδε σῆμα ἀνὴρ εἰδρυνσε γυναῖκί
 Ἑλπίζων Κυρίλλῃ, κὲ πάντε τέκνοισιν ἄωροις,
 ἐξ ἐτέροιο γάμον Κυρίλλης δύο θρεπτοῖς
 καὶ τρισὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις, Ζωίλῳ ἡδὲ [θυ]γατρὶ
 5 Τατιανῇ καὶ νύμφῃ Κυρίλλῃ ταχυ[μ]οίροις
 κὲ ζῶν αὐτὸς ἐαντῷ.

A man named Elpizon (Bunyan's 'Hopeful') erects this tomb to his wife Kyrilla, and five children (two of them his step-children, and the other three his own), and to himself, while yet alive. [It is noteworthy that the two step-children are here called *θρεπτοί*, which is usually applied to foundlings (*Cities and Bishopr. of Phr.* pp. 147, 350, 546), and they are mentioned before his own.] W. M. R.]

1. εἰδρυνσε = εἰδρυνσε, cf. Meisterhans, *gramm. der att. Inschriften*, p. 24 (ed. 1). 2. Ἑλπίζων 'διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς Ep. Col. i. 5' shows the inscription to be Christian. Κυρίλλῃ must be scanned Κῦρίλλῃ, as probably in v. 3, though there two long syllables are wanting, but in v. 5 we must take the word as Κῦρίλλῃ. 4. Ζωίλῳ must have the *ι* scanned as long. 5. Τατιανῇ, cf. Τατιανός cited in notes to iii. 1, and the numerous exx. of cognate names Τάτα, Τατάς, etc. in P. Kretschmer's *Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Gött. 1896), pp. 348-9. τὸν θεὸν σὺ μὴ ἀδικήσεις is a Christian formula,

as is proved by W. M. R. in *Expositor*, 1888 (Oct.), p. 258 (where he has published a translation of this inscription).

[The bad metre in this (and many similar epitaphs) is due, at least in part, to the fact that they were composed of standing formulae which were rudely adapted to suit the names of the persons buried in the grave. Elpizon purchased a tombstone (perhaps in Kotiaion, the nearest large city). It did not exactly suit him, for it was adorned with a relief representing only two children and one grown up person; but it was probably the most suitable that was ready in the stock of the mason's (or artist's) yard. He took a stock epitaph in metre and turned it to his own purposes. It enabled him to give the names only of two of his five children or step-children, Zoilos and Tatiane, and he added the names of the other three (who were all daughters) on the margin of the stone. It would appear that the name Tatiane was given both to one of his own daughters and to one of his step-daughters. His only son Zoilos married Kyrilla (who bears the same name as Elpizon's wife). Both Kyrilla and Kyrillos were adopted as common names in Christian use, though occasionally employed by pagans.] W. M. R.]

A. SOUTER.

Caius College, Cambridge.

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON GREEK GRAMMAR.

I. A use of ἐγώ.

In this *Review*, vol. x., no. 8, p. 381, Prof. Arthur Platt asks whether in Greek the pronoun must be expressed when the representative first person singular, 'I' = 'anybody you like,' is employed, as in Dem. *Phil.* iii. 17; [Xen.] *Resp. Ath.* i. 11; ii. 11, 12. This usage runs the risk of seeming egotistic, and there is in it a familiar, or at least a free and easy tone that naturally tends to restrict it to conversation; but it does not appear that the usage is, as Prof. Platt says, 'excessively rare' in Greek. The Greeks seem to have used it with considerable freedom in dialogue, and occasionally in other compositions of a didactic nature. To judge from Jowett's translation of Plato, we use it more

frequently than the Greeks did; but this may well be due to the greater need for it in a less inflected language; for, as will appear, this 'I' is often used for the sake of perspicuity.

Though the answer about to be made to the special question propounded is not absolutely conclusive, it is hoped that the facts contributed will not be without interest on their own account.

It seems best to restrict the question to the nominative case. The oblique cases have to be expressed if they are needed at the first occurrence of this use of the first singular in a given passage; otherwise the first singular would not appear at all. The only question with regard to them would be whether the strong forms are necessarily used; and this is answered in the negative

by the first example from the *Resp. Ath.* cited above. This fact, however, does not show that the nom. may be omitted; for *ἐγώ* sometimes has less emphasis than *ἐμοῦ*, *ἐμοί*, *ἐμέ* ever have except with prepositions. Moreover, as intimated by Prof. Platt, we must not be misled by emphasis that exists on other accounts. It will be found that when 'I' is thus used, there is generally a contrast with some other person or persons. From such examples, of course, no inference can be drawn. When there is no other cause for emphasis, the suggestion of Dr. Jackson, reported by Prof. Platt, that 'I' means 'I, for instance' and so might lead to the use of *ἐγώ*, seems sound. The nature of the stress on *ἐγώ* is made clear by [Plat.] *Just.* 374 E, *ὁφθαλμὸν ἐγὼ ἔχω δεξιὸν καὶ ἀριστερον ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄνθρωποι*; Now we give the pronoun three modes of utterance: the *emphatic*, marked by various cadences; the *distinct*, but without special cadence; the *obscure*, the diphthongal character almost vanishing. The Greeks used *ἐγώ* regularly for the English emphatic 'I,' often for the distinct, sometimes even for the obscure. In no example that I can invent, would the representative 'I' bear the obscure utterance. Hence it would not be surprising if the Greeks settled into the fixed habit of expressing the pronoun. But the question certainly cannot be answered affirmatively on *à priori* principles. The apostle Paul (*Gal.* ii. 18) at once confronts us with *εἰ γὰρ ἂν κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω*. Also (1 *Cor.* xiii. 1 ff.), *ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ κτέ.*—thirteen verbs without *ἐγώ* once. A scholiast (Westphal's *Aristoxenus*, vol. ii., p. 23, § 55, c) says concerning musical intervals: *ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰβ' ἂν διέλθω τὸν ἰβ' εἰς γ.δ καὶ πάλιν τὸν αὐτὸν ἰβ' εἰς γ.δ, ἐν μὲν τῇ εἰς γ.δ διαίρεσει γίγνεται τέτταρες τριάδες*. Of course these examples are not conclusive for the classical usage; but where Paul omits *ἐγώ* we cannot say *à priori* that Plato must have used it.

The examples I have collected are not intended to be exhaustive, but are only such as I could recall or find by a brief search. The subject is hardly of sufficient general importance to justify an irksome mechanical persual of all the Greek authors. The only *certain* example I can now add from the orators is Dem. xxiii. 55, where, after remarking that the law exculpates one who has by mistake slain a friend in battle, the speaker adds *καλῶς· εἰ γὰρ ἐγώ τινα ἐναντίων οἰηθεὶς εἶναι διέφθειρα, οὐ δίκην ὑπέχειν*

ἀλλὰ συγγνώμης τυχεῖν δίκαιός εἰμι. Here we have the slayer and the slain, two pronouns side by side, hence a rhetorical contrast, and no inference can be drawn. The omission of *ἐγώ* in the apodosis we should in any case expect. This contrast, actual or formal, is nearly always present. The very object of this use of 'I' is often to avoid the obscurity resulting from the use of two or more indefinite pronouns. Accordingly we sometimes find *ἐγώ* and *σύ* instead of *τις* and *ἕτερός τις*, where Aristotle would use A and B, as we sometimes do; for instance, Plat. *Crat.* 385 D (after *τις* has threatened to cause obscurity) *οὐ γὰρ ἔχω ἐγωγε ὀνόματος ἄλλην ὀρθότητα ἢ ταύτην, ἐμοὶ μὲν ἕτερον εἶναι καλεῖν ἐκάστω ὄνομα ὃ ἐγὼ ἐθέμην, σὸι δὲ ἕτερον ὃ ἂν σὺ*. Similarly 386 A, *οἷα μὲν ἂν ἐμοὶ φαίνηται τὰ πράγματα εἶναι, τοιαῦτα μὲν ἔστιν ἐμοί, οἷα δὲ σοὶ τοιαῦτα δ' αὖ σοί*, and nearly the same words *Theaet.* 152 A. Again, *Crat.* 434 E, *ἄλλο τι λέγεις τὸ ἔθος ἢ ὅτι ἐγώ, ὅταν τοῦτο φθέγγωμαι, διανοοῦμαι ἐκείνο, σὺ δὲ γινώσκεις ὅτι ἐκεῖνο διανοοῦμαι*; See also *Gorg.* 469 D, *Hipp. Maj.* 300 D, 303 B, *Legg.* iv. 719 D, xi. 913 A. In *Crat.* 385 A the contrast is between *ἐγώ* and everybody else: *ἐὰν ἐγὼ τοῦτο ἵππον προσαγορεύω ὃ νῦν καλοῦμεν ἄνθρωπον κτέ.* In *Phileb.* 14 D a man as *one* is contrasted with himself as *many*: *ἄρ' οὐν λέγεις, ὅταν τις ἐμὲ φῇ, Πρώταρχον, ἓνα γεγονότα φύσει, πολλοὺς εἶναι πάλιν τοὺς ἐμέ κτέ.* (where there is also formal contrast between 'some one' and 'me'). Sometimes the contrast is between more than two persons, as *Theaet.* 191 B (which may not be a real example); 192 D, *ἐγὼ εἰδώς Θεόδωρον...καὶ Θεαίτητον κτέ.* If any one will read rapidly the page preceding the last example, he will feel the need of a concrete case and will probably find it natural to read *ἐγώ* with some emphasis, although, since the other two men are introduced as objects of perception and knowledge rather than as persons, the contrast is not very marked.

Between the last example and the end of 193 are numerous instances of the omission of *ἐγώ*. So just after *Crat.* 434 E (quoted above), *ἐγώ* is omitted. Also *Theaet.* 159 C we find *Ὅταν δὴ οἶνον πίνω ἐγναίνω, ἡδὺς μοι φαίνεται καὶ γλυκύς*; Naï. But further on (160 A, C) the emphatic forms are again required to express contrast. These facts appear at first sight to prove that *ἐγώ* was expressed or omitted just as under ordinary circumstances; but there is a flaw in the evidence. It is a principle of Greek, as of other languages, that when a situation has

been assumed as a basis of discussion, it may be treated as if it were actual. Now in *Theaet.* 192 B ff., the representative *ἐγώ* has been introduced, and this prepares the way for the omission of *ἐγώ* just as it does for the use of obscure 'I' in English. Likewise in 159 C, not only has *ἐγώ* been used, but Socrates has, in B, explicitly made himself and Theaetetus representative persons. There is omission of *ἐγώ* also in *Phaed.* 99 A, εἰ δέ τις λέγοι ὅτι ἀνὲ τοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔχειν, καὶ ὅστ' αὐτὰ καὶ νῦν καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἔχω, οὐκ ἂν οἷός τ' εἶην κτέ.; but the example is weakened by the fact that Socrates is making his *actual situation* a representative case. In *Theaet.* 155 B, ὅταν φώμεν ἐμὲ σοῦ μείζω εἶναι, then in C εἰ μὴ γὰρ δι' ὃ πρότερον οὐκ ἦ, the acc. ἐμέ (necessarily emphatic because of contrast with σοῦ) has introduced the illustration. Other analogous examples might be cited. The following, if it is an example at all, as I am inclined to think it is, furnishes a clear instance of the omission of *ἐγώ*: *Parmen.* 143 C, Ἔστιν οὐσίαν εἰπεῖν; Ἔστιν. Καὶ αὐθις εἰπεῖν ἐν; Καὶ τοῦτο. Ἀρ' οὐχ' ἐκότερον αὐτῶν εἴρηται; Ναί. Τί δ' ὅταν εἰπω οὐσία καὶ ἐν, ἀρ' οὐκ ἀμφοτέρω; Πάνν γε. Οὐκοῦν καὶ ἐὰν οὐσία τε καὶ ἕτερόν τε καὶ ἐν, καὶ οὕτω πανταχῶς ἐφ' ἐκάστον ἀμφω λέγω; The use of *εἴρηται* renders it possible that Socrates has glided into the *actual situation* when he says ὅταν εἰπω. In *Aeschin. Ctes.* § 21, an objector is supposed to say ὅτι ἤρξαμην ἀποδημῆσαι; 'Because I obtained an office am I not to go abroad?' Here *ἐγώ* is omitted; but it is possible that the orator conceives of an *office-holder* making the objection.

Although no perfectly convincing proof has been produced for classical Greek, still the facts cited taken all together leave little doubt in my mind that it was, under favourable circumstances, allowable to omit the pronoun. I am convinced that the sentence of the scholiast quoted above might have been written by Plato, and it is possible that he did write such a sentence when he made Socrates say ὅταν εἰπω οὐσία καὶ ἐν.

II. A use of καί.

Prof. Platt also calls attention to the use of καί...δὲ καί in *Xen. Oec.* vii. 21, and μέν καί...δὲ καί in *Thuc.* i. 126 *ad fin.*, remarking that he does not remember to have seen it noticed anywhere. The usage is not entirely neglected by grammarians. Krüger, for instance, *Sprachelehre* § 69, 32, 15, mentions ὁ μὲν καί...ὁ δὲ καί and refers

to his commentary on *Thuc.* vii. 12, 1; 85, 4; viii. 47, 2; but the most he does at any of these places is to refer back to his grammar. Once when collecting evidence that πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι always means 'also many others' (see *Class. Rev.* vol. v., no. 9, p. 431), I had occasion to examine this phenomenon, but did not publish the results. Perhaps it will not be useless to do so now.

It is always best to dispense, if we can, with English renderings and try to view questions of this sort from the Greek standpoint. No matter how we should render the particles nor whether we can render them at all, it may safely be assumed that the Greeks never connected a pair of words or clauses simultaneously by means of two conjunctions felt as such. The general statement, then, of the phenomenon under discussion would be: When one clause is connected with another, two καί's referring to each other may occur, one in each clause, even when the second clause contains δέ; or, if we assume (as we safely may for the classical period) that the δέ of the second clause is connective, we can make a more comprehensive statement including cases where δέ does not occur: Two mutual καί's may occur in two clauses already connected with each other. In the passage quoted by Prof. Platt from *Xenophon*, the first καί may be retrospective rather than prospective, so that this may not be a real example; but the phenomenon is not very rare, and it is strange that, on its account, anyone should have condemned the opening lines of *Theocritus*.

When one of the clauses is subordinate to the other, we can feel the force of 'also' in each clause, though we do not so use it, as *Dem.* lii. 2, δέομαι οὖν ἑμῶν, εἴπερ τι καὶ ἄλλο πώποτε πρῶγμα αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτὸ ἐδικάσατε...οὕτω καὶ νῦν διαγιγνώσκει. 'I beseech you, if you ever judged also another matter on its own merits, so to render your decision also on this occasion.' *Xen. Conviv.* ii. 6, εἴπερ τι καὶ ἄλλο καὶ τοῦτο μαθητόν. 'If also any other thing, this also is learnable.' This use of καί...καί is familiar to beginners; but it does not seem certain that the Greeks felt any difference between it and the one under consideration, though the nearer we come to co-ordination the more unnatural appears our 'also...also,' as is seen in such familiar examples as *Andoc. Myst.* 140, συμφοραὶ μὲν γὰρ ἦδη καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἐγένοντο οὐκ ἐλάττωες ἢ καὶ ἡμῖν (in which a relative is felt after ἦ). *Aeschin. F.L.* 41, 25, ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς κατηγορίας ἠκούσατε...οὕτω

καὶ τῆς ἀπολογίας εὐτάκτως ἀκούσατε. [Plat.] *Alcib.* i. 110 D, ἔμαθον καὶ ἐγὼ ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 2. 5, ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ αἱ ἄλλαι τέχναι ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐξεργασμέναι εἰσὶ, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ τὰ παρὰ βασιλεῖ σῖτα ἐκπεποιήται. i. 6. 3, εἰκότως ἂν καὶ παρὰ θεῶν πρακτικώτερος εἴη ὥσπερ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. Entering the field of complete co-ordination, where 'also...also' is hardly bearable, we find, as in the examples cited by Prof. Platt and by Krüger, Plat. *Phaed.* 61 E, ἤδη γὰρ ἔγωγε καὶ Φιλολάου ἤκουσα...ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν. [Plat.] 'Αλκυνών iii., συχνὰ μὲν καὶ δι' ἀπορίαν, συχνὰ δὲ καὶ διὰ νηπιότητα φρενῶν. Analogous is καὶ...καὶ—δέ, as Dem. vii. 5, τῶν καὶ πρὶν ὑπεσχημένων καὶ νῦν δὲ πραττόντων. For τε...δὲ καὶ and τε...καὶ—δέ, see below. (These combinations appear to have led some to believe that in such expressions as καὶ στρατηγὸν δέ, it is δέ that means 'also'.) The second καὶ, just as when one of the clauses is subordinate, may be omitted, as Plat. *Theat.* 142 B, χαλεπῶς μὲν γὰρ ἔχει καὶ ὑπὸ τραυμάτων τινῶν, μᾶλλον μὴν αὐτὸν αἰρεῖ τὸ νόσημα. Or the second καὶ may immediately precede some other word closely connected with the emphatic one, as Plat. *Menon* 94 E, ἴσως μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει ῥεδιὸν ἐστὶ κακῶς ποιεῖν ἀνθρώπους ἢ εὖ, ἐν τῇδε δὲ καὶ πάνν. Examples containing πολλοὶ καὶ ἄλλοι (where καὶ is certainly not like that in πολλοὶ καὶ καλοὶ) exhibit, of course, the same varieties, as Aeschin. *Tim.* 15, 25, κατὰ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, οὐχ ἡκιστα δὲ καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα. Xen. *Conver.* ii. 9, ἐν πολλοῖς μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες, καὶ ἄλλοις δῆλον, καὶ ἐν οἷς δὲ ἡ παῖς ποιεῖ. *Anab.* vi. 4. 4, ξύλα δὲ πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, πάνν δὲ πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ναυπηγήσιμα (second καὶ omitted). So Plat. *Parmen.* 133 B, πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μέγιστον δὲ τόδε (where μέγιστον renders καὶ needless). Aeschin. *Tim.* 6, 38, πολλὰ πέν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα καταγέλαστα πέπρακται...ἐν δὲ ὃ καὶ διηγέσασθαι ὕμνιν βούλομαι (second καὶ shifted). Here καταγέλαστα, like ναυπηγήσιμα a few lines above, has no καὶ connecting it with πολλὰ.

It is also a significant fact that the negative of καὶ...καὶ—δέ is not οὔτε...οὔτε—δέ, but οὐδὲ...οὐδὲ—δέ, as Xen. *Anab.* i. 8. 20, καὶ οὐδὲν μέντοι οὐδὲ τοῦτον παθεῖν ἔφασαν, οὐδ' ἄλλος δὲ ἔπαθεν οὐδεὶς οὐδέν, showing that the negative of the first καὶ is felt rather as our 'also not' than as our

'neither.' So Isaeus iii. 50, οἶμαι δὲ οὐδ' ἂν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκείνον οὐδ' ἄλλον δὲ κτέ. (where some write δὴ, others γε, against the MSS.). In like manner the first καὶ may become οὐδέ when the second is omitted, as Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 2. 20, τοῦτον μὲν οὐδ' αὐτὸς δύναμαι περιγενέσθαι, ἀλλ' εἰμὶ ἀπληστος καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ οἱ ἄλλοι. Here καὶ before ἐγὼ is the affirmative of οὐδέ before αὐτός, and the ὥσπερ clause has no καὶ as it might have.

Taking into consideration all the facts adduced, we are justified in believing that to the Greek mind καὶ...καὶ in co-ordinate clauses connected by δέ was not essentially different from καὶ...καὶ where one clause is subordinate to the other.

There is a usage which at first glance might seem to militate against this view, though in fact it rather lends additional support. I refer to the fact that we sometimes find, not καὶ but τε in the first clause, followed by δὲ καὶ and καὶ—δέ, as Plat. *Euthyphro* 3 E, σύ τε κατὰ νοῦν ἀγωνεῖ τὴν δίκην, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ἐμὲ τὴν ἐμήν. Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 3. 40, οἱ τε ἀρχόντες καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ σωφρονούντες. The combination τε...καὶ, it is true, cannot be used when one clause is subordinated to the other; but this is for the simple reason that prospective τε is of the nature of prospective μὲν to a sufficient degree to require a corresponding retrospective conjunction or conscious asyndeton, so that when the clauses are co-ordinate we not rarely find τε...δέ where there is no καὶ and no question of καὶ, and consequently there can be no obstacle to the insertion of 'also' or 'even'; so that in τε...δέ καὶ it is δέ and not καὶ that is paired with τε.

Prof. Platt elsewhere in his article points out the fact that τε or καὶ, meaning 'both,' may be followed by asyndeton. This is the view I have always taken of the passages he cites. In my edition of the *Antigone* τε is omitted in v. 673, but the note on v. 296 is: 'καὶ, both. The asyndeton of the next two clauses, with the subject (τόδε after τοῦτο as in 673) repeated, keeps up the force of the series which καὶ introduces.' To the same effect Prof. D'Ooge on v. 673: 'π ὅ λ ε ι ς τ ε: as though καὶ or τε were to follow. So καὶ in 296.'

MILTON W. HUMPHREYS.

University of Virginia.

THE 'DATIVE' OF THE POSSESSOR.

THE pages of Homer abound in constructions like *δαῖνός δέ οἱ ὄσσε φάανθεν* (*Il.* 1, 200), just as Vergil is very fond of non unquam gravis aere domum *mihi dextra* redibat (*Ecl.* 1, 35), and the like. These uses are generally explained as simply developments of the dative case: they are given as a branch of the *Ethic* dative (or dative of the person interested), or as a branch of the *dativus commodi* (or dative of the person benefited). But it must be clear that the exact present meaning of most of these uses is not adequately conveyed by these abstract expressions. The assumption that the writer, in using this case rather than the genitive of the possessor, intended to denote either that the man was *interested in*, or that he was *benefited by*, his eyes or his hand or his mind or his words or his mother or his horses, is surely untenable: the best translations render them as simple possessives, and such I believe to be not only their exact present meaning in most instances, but also their earliest known meaning in such contexts: it would, I believe, be a great relief to the conscientious translator if he could safely regard the cases in such contexts as simple possessives throughout their known history.

In examining the instances one cannot help noticing how many of them are *pronouns*: and I shall try to show that, at any rate in pronouns, the *Indo-European* case in *-i* had, among other uses, a use as a simple possessive.

To begin with *Sanskrit*, we find the *dative* case¹ used of the goal of motion, whether that goal be place (this is not very common) or an action: we also find it used of the result etc. (cp. the Latin predicative dative, to some extent), and with certain verbs like to give, to pay reverence, to offer salutation, to send, to give a message, etc., where we sometimes use the preposition 'to.' But I do not know of any instance where it is used in a phrase at all corresponding to Homer's *ὄσσε δέ οἱ* (above).

On the other hand we do find that certain pronouns have an *enclitic* form which is sometimes *genitive* (possessive, etc.) and sometimes *dative* (vide the above uses). The forms *mē* and *tē* would probably have been once identical with *μοι* and *τοι*.

Now if we supposed that such forms as

¹ By this I mean the dative which once probably ended in *-ai* (cp. *δοῦν-αι* *dar-ei* → *dar-i*).

these (cp. *οἱ* above, *σοι*, Latin *mī*,² *illī*, *eī*, *nullī*, etc.) had in early times not only a dative use, but also a possessive use (which was not derived from this dative use), we should have a reasonable explanation of the existence of forms like *μοι*, *σοι*, *τοι* in *Homer*, and forms like *mī*, *illī*, *eī*, *nullī*, etc. in *early Latin* (e.g. *Plautus* and *Terence*), with both *genitive* and *dative* uses. For the existence of a single form of a pronoun with two or more case-meanings, of which no single one is likely to have given rise to the other two, cp. e.g. the *Sanskrit* uses of the enclitic *nāu* and *vām* as *genitive* and *dative* and *accusative* in the dual, and *nas* and *vas* as the same cases in the plural. Cp. also certain *Homeric* uses of the *-φι*-case as an *instrumental*, *locative*, *dative*, *ablative*, and *genitive*. (*Monro*, p. 148 foll.).

It seems far easier to suppose that such a wide range of meanings was the result of a still wider range of meanings being confined to certain channels than that it was the result of a single definite case-meaning.

What happened to these forms in later language?

(i.) The pronouns were still used not only as *datives*, but also as (chiefly possessive) *genitives* in *poetry*, where there is a tendency to preserve old constructions (cp. the survival in *poetry* of simple cases, without prepositions, expressing the country in or from which—a construction common in early language).

(ii.) This use of pronouns which were like '*datives*' in form, and were not only '*datives*' but also *possessives* in meaning, sometimes led to a use of nouns which were '*datives*' in form, not only as '*datives*' but also as *possessives* in meaning. It is held by many that certain nouns derived their forms for the *nominative* plural (e.g. *οἴκοι* *vici*) and *genitive* plural (e.g. *vicōrum*) from the pronouns. The use of '*dative*' forms of nouns with *possessive* as well as '*dative*' meanings is found in *Homeric* uses like *Ἐκτορι* *θυμός*, and in *Vergilian* *datives* like *ardet apex capiti* (*Aen.* 10, 270), and in uses in *Cicero's Letters* like *Cūriōnī* *nostrō* *tribūnātus* *conglaciāt* (*ad Fam.* 8, 6). Without attempting to deny for a moment that many classical uses not unlike this may have been derived wholly or partly from the *dative* meanings,

² *mī* might have had a double origin, being also descended from *mihi* (cp. *nihil* → *nil*).

and without attempting to deny that the classical dative in many such uses conveyed a different shade of meaning from the classical genitive, I would only suggest here that the possessive use would help to account for certain instances of Ethic datives like *laudāvit mihi frātre*.

(iii.) But as a rule such pronoun-forms came to be regarded more and more as datives, and the uses of *μοι* etc. became

more and more dative, more and more like the uses of e.g. *ἀνθρώπῳ* in their range.

As evidence that Greek did sometimes regard the forms like *μοι* not merely as possessives, etc., but even as actual genitives, it will be sufficient here to mention instances like *μοι... ἀνδρὸς θυτήνῳ* (*Od.* 11, 75), etc., and the regular Thessalian use of *-οι* forms as genitives.

EUSTACE H. MILES.

CONTESTED ETYMOLOGIES.

(Continued from p. 94.)

VIII.—SANSKRIT *viṣva* 'ALL.'

§ 1. A. Kuhn (*K.Z.* 2, 272) compared *īśos* 'equal,' deriving *viṣva* from *viś* 'folk': '*viṣva* ist das ihnen zukommende, gemeinsame, daher im griechischen worte der begriff der gleichheit und ähnlichkeit.'

Comparison with Lith. *visas* 'all' tantalizingly suggests itself. The phonetics, if normal, would require **viszva*, cf. *aszvā*: Sk. *āśvā* 'mare.'

§ 2. There is no cogent proof however of Aryan *vikvo-* in other languages. Meister (*K.Z.* 31, 309) brings forward *ῥιππίξενος* from a tomb at Tanagra, and compares this with the Doric name *Βίππος* and Sk. *viṣva*. Who knows but that *ῥιππος* is for **ῥικπος* (cf. *αἰ-πόλος* 'goat herd' for *αἰγ-πόλος*), and ultimately akin to Sk. *viṣ-pāti* 'lord of the folk,' or is related with *vip-ra* 'seer' (*√vip* 'tremble')? I compare *vipra-vāhas* (*R.V.*) 'having the gifts of seers' with *ῥιππίξενος* 'having seers as guests (?)' In Latin *√vip* appears as *vib-* in *vibrare* 'to make tremble.'¹ With *ῥιππο-* we can compare *Vib-ius*, the name of a Roman gens.

§ 3. Looking at Sanskrit alone I would attach *viṣva-* directly to *viś* in the sense of the citation from Kuhn given above. I believe however that *viṣva* has suffered a popular change from **viṣva*, cf. *viśvañc*, 'nach beiden (allen) seiten gewandt.' Another effective cause of change in orthography may have been **ca-çvant* < **sṃ-çvant*.

§ 4. Now if *viṣva* is a special abnormality of Indiranic (cf. Avest. *višpo* for **višpo-* then we may compare Lith. *visas* 'all' and its Balto-Slavic cognates. In Greek (Cretic) *ῥισφόρ* is apparently cognate from the standpoint of phonetics. As to its signification

of 'equal,' this develops very naturally from that of 'to both sides' (cf. Sk. *viśvañc*).

§ 5. As I have noted above Sk. *vi-śu* is one of the words out of which an Aryan *vi-* 'two' has been inferred. Johansson (*B.B.* 14, 171) extends this stem to **evi* on the basis of Avest. *avi-* and Homeric *ἔϊσος* and *ἔϊκοσι*. It is perfectly futile to regard Sk. *vi* as an apocopated form for **a/vi*, and compare Avest. *avi*, which corresponds to Sk. *abhī*. That this *avi* is used with the abl. in a separative relation is no argument that it is different from *avi* with the acc. in the approximative relation, for *παρά* with the gen. and with the acc. shows precisely the same shift in signification. As to *ἔ-ἔκοσι* and *ἔ-ἔσος*, Curtius (*Grdzg.* 5 p. 581) gives a perfectly satisfactory explanation of the incorrect assumption of *ἔ-* by analogy before almost any lost digamma. Schulze (*K.Z.* 29, 235) writes in this strain: 'Die fälle der vokalprothese vor digamma wie *ἔ-ἔκοσι*, *ἔ-ἔδνα* u. s. f. in diese frage hineinzuziehen ist baare willkür, da wir keinerlei vernünftigen grund haben, die möglichkeit eines solchen *ἔ-* vorschläges zu leugnen.'²

² The statistics of *ἔσος* in Homer yield an interesting result. He uses fourteen times in the *Iliad* as a verse ending *ἀσπίδα πάντοσ' ἔσση*, twice *ἀσπίδα ... π. ε.*, and once *ἀσπίδι πάντοσ' ἔσση*. He further uses *ῥῆς ἔσση* or *δαίρς ἔσση* sixteen times (*Iliad* and *Odyssey*) as a verse-close, and *δαίρς μὲν ἔσση* once (*I.* 225) not at the end of a verse. There are seventeen other verse-closes of the nom. or acc. plur. of the same paradigms *ῥῆς ἔσση* and *δαίρς ἔσση*, nine in the *Odyssey* and eight in the *Iliad*. We have at A 337 *φρίνας ἔσση ἔσση*. On a totally different footing is B 765 *σταφύλη ἐπὶ νῆτον ἔσση*. There is no valid reason why we should not write *πάντοσε ἔσση* for the first cases cited. In all the other cases *δαίρς ἔσση*, say, could stand instead of *ἔσση*. Spondaic verses form, it is known, about four per cent. of Homer's verses. There was a false division of *πάντοσε ἔσση* to *πάντοσ' ἔσση* which never spread beyond the feminine *ἔσση*, in which Johansson invites us to see a continuation of Aryan **evi*!

¹ Unless this is a compound of *vi* + *br-* as I have suggested in *Am. Jr. Phil.* xiii. p. 481.

§ 6. A word needs to be said of the phonetics of Lith. *visas*, viz.:—whether *s* (*ss*, cf. O. Pruss. *wissas*) may represent *sv*. It is certain that this is the normal treatment of initial *sv*. (cf. Osthoff, *Pezf.* p. 456), and no example has been cited to disprove the same law for medial *-sv-*. For the phonetics of *Fīafos* I refer to Brugmann, *Gr.* i. § 620, 7.

§ 7. It is easy to illustrate the shift of meaning involved in these comparisons. Let us take a sentence 'food was given to both sides': this implies that an equal supply of food is given to *all* and *each*. Such locutions as German *alle beide*, French *tous deux*, *tous les deux* also warrant this association of ideas.¹

IX.—LATIN *vicissim* 'BY TURNS.'

Here we have, in my opinion, no locative **vic-essi* as some have thought (cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* p. 556), a form which it would be difficult to account for in Latin. I suggest that what we have is an accus. plur. *vicis*, corresponding to the adverbial accus. sg. *vicem* (*meam* etc.) 'in my turn' (cf. Cic. *de dom.* 4, 8, and Riemann, *Syntaxe Latine*² § 41); to *vicis* an ending *-im* has been added by analogy with *partim* 'in part.'

X.—ἀπέλλαι σηκοί, ἐκκλησίαι, ἀρχαιρεσίαι (HESYCHIUS).

§ 1. In a review of Savelsberg *de digammo* etc. (*K.Z.* 17, 316) Rödiger writes as follows: 'Dass lakon. ἀπέλλα (attisch = ἀλία) aus ἀφελ- ja, ἀφελία (vgl. ἀφολλῆς) abzuleiten ist, darf wohl als sicher angesehen werden.' This sentence, penned before the phonetic laws became inviolable, fairly matches our latter-day positiveness of assertion. Fick (*B.B.* 8, 331) compares ἀπέλλαι with τέλος 'crowd.' Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v.) accepts this, deriving our word from *ā cop.* + **qelnā*. Normal phonetics would require *ἀτέλλαι.

§ 2. Now σηκός means 'chapel, burial-place,' while ἐκκλησία means 'church' or 'congregation.' We may fairly conclude that ἀπέλλα means 'burial-place, burial-company.' I propose to connect ἀπέλλαι with Lat. *sepelio* 'bury,' and Sk. *saparyati* 'he worships,' used pre-eminently with Agni as its object. Burial is of course an act of worship by a religious assemblage. The Sanskrit stem *sapary-* can hardly come from anything but *sm + √pr* 'fill up,' or from *sm + 2 √pr*

'pass by together.' The Hindu ritual books make it clear that worshipping the gods or the Manes meant filling them up with good things. From Lat. *exsequias ire* we get a clue for *sm + 2 √pr* 'pass along together.' If, however, Sk. *sapary-* belongs with Lat. *sepelio* the *l* of the latter makes for the sense 'fill up, satisfy.' There can be no objection on the phonetic side to comparing ἀπέλλαι with Sk. *sapary-*. In Latin we should expect **sempelio*, however. There was in Latin, I suggest, a popular connection between *sepulcrum* 'grave,' and *sēpio* 'hedge in,'² cf. Cic. *Tusc.* v. 64; 'septum undique et vestitum vepribus et dumetis indagavi sepulcrum.' To this association we might ascribe *sepelio* for **sempelio*.

§ 3. If *sepelio* 'bury' shows an earlier meaning than Sk. *sapary-* 'worship,' possibly the sense of *sm + pr* was originally purely physical and meant 'fill up the earth in the grave.'

XI.—LATIN *frequens* 'FREQUENT, CROWDING.'

§ 1. There are two objections to referring *frequens* to *farcio* 'stuff': 1° *farcio*, φράσσω do not show anywhere else a 'velar'—an objection which is not insuperable in my opinion; 2° *frequens senatus* is, according to Curtius (*Græc.* p. 302) 'a crammed meeting'; therefore we should more naturally expect a past ptc. as in *refertus confertus*.

§ 2. In the reference of *frequens* to *farcio* over-emphasis is laid on the connection of *saepe* with *saepio* 'hedge,'³ for which the better orthography is *sēpio*. It is much more reasonable to believe that *saepe* 'often' belongs to *semper* 'always.' The relation of meaning is just that shown for the negative of these expressions by the 'never' and 'hardly ever' of Pinafore. The nasal that has fallen out before *p* we may ascribe to dialectic phonetics (e.g. Umbr. *seples* = Lat. *simpulis*), or to a sporadic phonetic change that was never universalised in Latin. At any rate Latin inscriptions are full of such omissions of the nasals (cf. Seelmann, *Auseprache* 273 sq., 281 sq.), and the same phenomenon is common in Greek, (Brugmann, *Gr. Gram.*² p. 40). This probably represents after all a tendency toward a nasalisation of the vowel, particularly in the vulgar pronunciation (cf. Kretschmer, *K.Z.* 29, 438 sq.), and *saepe* is probably a

² For the etymology of *sēpio*, see below xi. § 2.

³ Wharton (*Et. Lat.* s.vv.) further derives *cunctus* from *cingo* 'gird' (!), and *omnis* from *ob-* in the sense of 'comprehensive' (!).

¹ I had a negro man-servant tell me once at a door: 'Mr. Fay, the young ladies both of 'em are all out.'

vulgar *sepe*. That *saepe* and *semper* should be adapted to different meanings was inevitable. The association of **sepe* 'often' with *saepe* 'thick-set (hedge)' would not be an improbable result of popular etymology. I suggest that *septus* may be a compound of **sem-* and the ptc. *aptus* 'fastened,' cf. *coepus* from *com* and *aptus*; see below xiii.

§ 3. I therefore have to propose for *frequens* the divisions *fre-quens* 'door-crowding,' or, as we say in English, 'jamb-full.' In this way *-quens* belongs to πᾶντ 'all' and Sk. *śāvant* 'crowding together': √*śū* 'swell out.' I define *fre-quens* 'swelling-out to the door.' This explanation explains the *q*, and also the use of the pres. ptc.

§ 4. I see in *fre-* a quasi-preposition related to *foris* 'outside,' *foras* 'doorwards.' The word *for-is* 'a door' is probably an *i*-stem that has taken the place of a consonant stem, cf. Sk. *dvār-*; while *θύρα* and the adv. *for-as* seem to be transfers to the *a*-declension. The Latin plur. *for-es*, however, (gen. *for-um*) and Sk. *dūr-as* (for **dhur-as*, cf. Brugmann, *Gr. i.* § 480) belong alike to the consonant declension. We may therefore ascribe *fre-quens* to a locative **fri* (> *fre*) *quens* 'swelling to the door.' We might, however, start with **fori-quens* 'crowding the forum.' This would become in composition with *in*, say **infri-quens* > **infer-quens*, whence, by a metathesis common enough in Latin (cf. *Phrygio*, *corcotarii*, Plautus, *Aul.* 508, 521, and Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.* pp. 91, 97), *infrequens*.

§ 5. On the side of meaning I would claim that from the phrase *frequens senatus* 'a jamb-full senate' *frequens* was extended to other uses. In Plautus (*Mil.* 594) we seem to have a place where the meaning of *fre-quens senatus* can be fixed right narrowly:

nam Palaestrio
domi nunc apud mest, Sceledrus nunc
autemst *foris*:

frequens senatus poterit nunc habier. Possibly the point in the use of *frequens* is that when the senate was crowded some were out of the doors, the crowd being too great for the space. This explanation is also borne out by *frequentare* 'visit often,' usually with the object 'house.'

§ 6. Objection is made, I am aware to the equation of πᾶντ in ἀπᾶντ with Sk. *śāvant* in *śāvant*; Prellwitz after accepting this equation under *ἀπᾶς* denies it under πᾶς: 'die oben unter *ἀπᾶς* angeführte Gleichung ist unrichtig, da ai. (i.e. Sk.) *śāvant* zu einer √*śā* gehören muss.' Bréal also

rejects this etymology (*Extrait du Journal d. Savants*, Août 1894, p. 10). It is still maintained by Brugmann (*Totalität* p. 27-). Wackernagel also sticks by it (*Altind. Gram.* § 197a). Outside of Sanskrit and Greek this word for 'all' seems also to be found, as Brugmann has pointed out, in Albanian *gje* 'ganz, jeder.' According to the explanation I have suggested for *fre-quens*, Latin also preserves this word in *-quens*.

§ 7. There would be difficulty in equating *ἀπᾶς* with *śāvant* if we regarded the inflection as on precisely the same footing, for in that case we must needs have **ἀπᾶν*. The difficulty is resolved by noting that in Sanskrit √*śū* is also treated as **śv-ā*: so in Greek the ptc. comes from **kv-ā* and is on the same footing as *στᾶς*: ἰ-στᾶ-μι. In Latin, on the other hand, *-quent-* is the weak stem, corresponding to Sk. (śā-)śvat-.

§ 8. The root of Sk. √*śū* || *śvā* is very well represented in Latin, not only in *inciens* 'pregnant' (: Grk. κνέω, same meaning), but also in *queo* 'be able.' I am aware that Osthoff has lately (*I.F.* vi. 12-) come forward as a champion of the theory that sees in *queo* the relative stem, and compares *οἶός τε εἰμὶ*. 'I am one to'—'am able.' Osthoff lays stress on the entire conformity of *queo* to the type of *eo* in its inflection, and derives from a suffixless locative **qē + ire* in the sense of 'turn out, succeed' which he shows to have developed for verbs of motion. Granting all that Osthoff claims for the synonymic differentiation of *possum* and *queo*, granting that *queo* means 'I am in a position to' nothing is disproved for the comparison with √*śū* 'swell': *queo* may have meant, to start with, 'I am increased up to.' No one can deny, on the other hand, considering Grk. *οἶός τε εἰμὶ*, that *queo* may be of relative origin. Still we have in Greek both the relative (τῷ) and its correlative!

§ 9. There are three supposed ways in which *queo* followed the type of *eo* according to Osthoff. 1° Latin *eq-ē* represents the weak grade of Sk. √*śak* 'be able,' extended by *-ē*. But *queo* **quēs* **quet* would scarcely have followed the pattern of *eo* *is it*, with *eo* as the only point of analogy; 2° *queo* follows *eo* because there was an Aryan **qey-mi* **qey-si* etc. like **ey-mi* *eysi* etc.—but there is no proof of *qey-mi* etc.; 3° *queo* is a compound of *qu-* + *eo*.

§ 10. I note however that in Sanskrit √*śū* makes a present *śv-aya-ti* 'he is strong.' As to this Osthoff says: "das (*śvayāmi*) nun einmal in seiner Bedeutung nur un-

genügend zu *queo* stimmen will'; why 'ungenügend'? Does not he himself virtually admit (p. 22) that *valeo* 'be strong' is a practical synonym of *possum*? No one will, I presume, deny that *inciens* 'pregnant' belongs with Grk. κύνω Sk. *ṛv-aya-ti*. If it is to be explained as to its form we may operate with **inçeyens* > **inciçyens* > *inciens*. The assumption that **qéyo*, **qéyes*, **qéyet* gave *qéo*, **qéys*, **qeyt* cannot, I believe, be successfully controverted. The treatment of the Aryan group *-eye-* is not to be regarded as settled by *trēs* 'three' < **treyes*, any more than by the acc. *trīs* < **treyes*, for *trīs* (acc.) may be the normal form and *trēs* (nom.) an analogical form. My explanation of **qéyes* > **qéys* is on precisely the same footing as *aes* 'brass' < **ay(e)s*: Sk. *āyas*. It is a mere question of chronology: did the intervocalic *y* disappear before the loss of the post-tonic vowel? The diphthong of *aes-* seems to settle the matter, for inasmuch as Umbrian shows *dhēsnes* = Lat. *ahēnis* we have no right to regard Lat. *ae* as a contraction of *a(y)e*, but rather as syncopated from *āy(e)*. This conclusion lacks complete cogency, however, 1° because the question can be raised why syncope did not take place in Italic **āy(e)sno-* as in *āy(e)s* > *aes*; to which it may be replied that syncope in a closed syllable is a different thing from syncope in an open syllable, as in *cōmprīmo* where *i* is a quasi-syncope at least, but *compressi*: 2° because *aes* may be explained as **ay-s*, the reduced grade of *ay-es-* (cf. Osthoff, *P.B.B.* 13, 405 Anm.).

§ 11. It is not as difficult, however, as Osthoff seems to think to find reasons why *queo* should fall under the analogy of *eo*, even if *queo* went originally by the second conjugation. The present subjunctives are alike, *queam*, *eam*, and the supines, *itum* and *quitum*, while *nequit* and *ne-queo* are certainly as normal as *it* and *eo*. Who shall say that *quēvi* for *quēvi* is not on the same footing as *lēvi lēvi*, or as *filius* for *fēlius*? There was, pace Osthoff, a distinct parallelism of notions in *queo*, and *eo*, viz. when they were used as auxiliary verbs; I cite from Cato (ap. Festus, p. 242, Müller): quod uti prohibitum irem, quod in me esset, meo labori non parsi, where the substitution of *quērem* for *irem* would make no noticeable change in the sense. The Latin grammar specially enjoins upon us that for verbs that form no fut. infin. pass. in supine + *iri*, we are to use *posse*. This ground for an analogy between *queo* and *eo* certainly does not exist in the case of *fleo*, *neo*, *-pleo*. These verbs were held in place by *flē-tus*, *nē-men*, *plē-nus*, but

even so we have *nit* and *neunt* from *neo*, and these are usually explained as analogical with *it* and *eunt* (cf. Löwe, *Prodromus*, 409 and Stolz, *Gram.* 2 § 100).

§ 12. So far as I can see it makes little difference which of the etymologies shall finally prevail, but Osthoff does not seem to me to strengthen the claims of kinship with the relative by his explanation from **qē + eo*: suffixless locatives like **qē* are very much in the air for Latin. Besides οἶός τε *cipl* never gave rise in Greek to a verb ἵστημι 'I am able.'

XII.—GREEK ὄψα 'WIFE': LATIN soror 'SISTER.'

§ 1. It is a commonplace of Latin phonetics that *swe-* gives *so-*. This is inferred from *somnus* 'sleep' beside ON *svefer*. There is no proof however that this does not come from **swoyno*, just as Armen. *k'un* (cf. Brugmann, *Gr.* ii. § 66), Lith. *sāpnas*. Another alleged example is *socer* 'father-in-law': ἑκρός, but the phonetics of *socer* must be considered liable to infection from *sociare* 'join in marriage.'

§ 2. If these cases do not prove the law Aryan *swe-* > Lat. *so-*, still it must be admitted that *sex* 'six' which is probably from Aryan **sweks* does not disprove it, for the Aryan form seems to have had a doublet **seks*.¹

§ 3. Now if it is not proved that Aryan *swe-* gives Lat. *so-*, there is no reason why Greek ὄψα 'wife' is not to be compared with Sk. *svāsar* and Lat. *soror*. I assume the primitive paradigm was **svēsor*, gen. **svēs-r-ēs* (cf. Sk. dat. *svāsre*, where the accent has been shifted to suit the nom.). Now if *ē* was only a tonic vowel in Aryan, the gen. **svēs-r-ēs* probably gave **svos-r-ēs* and thus the stem was liable to gradation. In Greek the plur. ὄπαες derives from **svosrr-es* > **ō-āp-es* whence **ōāpes* > ὄπαες.

There is no difficulty from the meaning of ὄπα, for Juno, we know, was 'et soror et coniunx.'

§ 4. From *soror*, ὄπα OBLg. *sestra*, Lith. *sesų* we may ask ourselves whether the Aryan stem was **sweer-* or **seer-*, with such a variation as seen in Greek *τοῖ* beside *τοῖ* < **tvoī*, or in the Aryan pair just treated **sveks* || **seks*. My own belief is that the *w* was parasitic, arising by anticipation from **se-sros* (gen.),

¹ In view of the assimilations seen in Sk. *ṣaṣ*, Lith. *szasz* 'six' the form **ksveks* set down as the oldest Aryan form by Prellwitz (*Et. Wört.* s.v. *ἕξ*) is to be regarded as a form with assimilated spirant groups reaching back into the primitive period (i.e. **ksveks* is for **sveks*).

where the second syllable must needs be spoken with 'rounding.' Instances of this rounding are Sk. *tvaks*:-|*taks* 'build,' Aryan **svaks*|*seks* 'six,' *tar*- 'pass' (cf. *táras* 'speed') and *tvar*- 'hasten.' The original word for 'sister' I take to have been a reduplicating child word like *mama*, *papa*, say, **sesa* (cf. Grk. *τέρα* 'papa' for the vowels). This was afterwards brought into relation with the other *r*-stems like *māter* etc., and inflected accordingly.

I can find nothing plausible in Johnson's **s-t-er* 'house' **s-er* 'woman' (: *√es* 'be'?), on which he bases Sk. *svá sara* 'Hürde, Stall' and *svá-sar* 'sister' (*I.F.* 3, 226).

XIII.—*Simpulus* *simpuvium* 'SACRIFICIAL VESSELS.'

In the etymology of *saepus* suggested above (xi. § 2) I have made use of the pre-

position **sem* = Sk. *sa*-. This preposition seems to me also to exist in Latin in the words *sim-pulus* and *sim-puvium*, as well as in *sepelio* (*supra* x. § 2). I would connect *sim-pulus* and *sim-puvium* with Sk. *sam* + *pā* 'cleanse,' used particularly of the soma-preparation, cf. *pā-tus* 'clean.' The Latin words are very archaic and of a specially sacrosanct character. *Saeptus* was also a sacred word: *uti locus ante eam aram... stipitibus robustis saepiatur*, Inscr. Orell. 642; *aediculam, aram, saeptum, clusum, vetustate diruta restituit*, *ib.* 1515. The sacredness of *sepelio* is also evident. These are the words in which I propose to see the Italic preposition **sem*- cognate with *semol*, i.e. *simul*.

EDWIN W. FAY.

Lexington, Va.

NOTE ON *DIDACHE* 1, 2, AND ACTS 15, 20, 29.

It is well known that the precept contained in Matt. 7, 12 and Luke 6, 31 is found in a negative setting in Jewish literature, and especially in the book *Tobit* [*ὁ μισεῖς, μηδενὶ ποιήσεις*], and it has been suggested that this is the source from which Διδ. 1, 2 [*πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐν θελήσει μὴ γίνεσθαι σοὶ καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποιεῖς*] is derived.

To some extent this must be true. That is to say, no doubt can be entertained that there is a Jewish source, adequately represented by *Tobit*, both for the negative precept in the Διδ., and also for the positive one in the Gospels (which was perhaps intended to correct the narrow view which the negative saying suggests). But there is also some ground for thinking that two forms of the saying ought to be recognized, and that one of them points to a connection between the Διδ. and the Western text of Acts.

The two forms found are as follows:—

A form.

1. Καὶ ὁ μισεῖς μηδενὶ ποιήσεις. *Tobit* 4, 15.
2. Τοῦτο βραχέως ἢ γράφῃ δεδήλωκεν εἰρηκνῶν ὁ μισεῖς, ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις. Clem. Al. *Strom.* ii. 23.
3. Ὁ γὰρ μισεῖς σοὶ γίνεσθαι οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ σὺ ποιήσεις. *Didasc.* iii. 15, and similarly, 1, 1.

B form.

1. Πάντα δὲ ὅσα ἐν θελήσει μὴ γίνεσθαι σοὶ καὶ σὺ ἄλλῳ μὴ ποιεῖς. Διδ. 1, 2.

This is also used by the compiler of the *Judicium Petri*:—

Ματθαῖος εἶπεν πάντα ὅσα μὴ θέλεις σοὶ γίνεσθαι μὴδὲ σὺ ἄλλῳ ποιήσεις.

2. καὶ ὅσα ἂν μὴ θέλωσιν ἑαυτοῖς γενέσθαι ἑτέροις μὴ ποιέω. Acts 15, 20 and (29) in Dh^l.^{ms.} pw² Sah. Iren., Cyprian.

Theophilus may be quoting it loosely in *ad Autol.* vi. 34:—

3. καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν μὴ βούληται ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτῷ γίνεσθαι ἵνα μὴδὲ ἄλλῳ ποιῇ.

A conflation of the A and B forms is found in the Apostolical Constitutions:—

πάν ὃ μὴ θέλεις γενέσθαι σοὶ τοῦτο ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις, τοῦτ' ἐστίν· ὃ σὺ μισεῖς ἄλλῳ οὐ ποιήσεις. *Const.* vii. 1.

It is clear that the evidence for the B form is really reducible to the *Διδαχὴ* and the Western text of Acts. It seems improbable that two writers should corrupt the older and terser A form in the same way, and therefore it is more than possible that

there is a connection between the two documents. But the evidence does not seem to show whether the Western Acts used the *Διδαχὴ*, or the *Διδαχὴ* the Western Acts. The case for the former theory is that the *Διδαχὴ*, or rather the ground-document (which we may call the 'Two ways'), was current in Syria before the end of the first century; and that the Western reviser, though later than this, was, according to Prof. Ramsay, well acquainted with Syria. Or, if we accept Prof. Blass' view, and consider the Western text to be the earlier form of the Acts, it is easy to understand that, in writing to proselytes, the Apostles would quote what was quite probably a Jewish text-book for proselytes.

On the other hand, the latter theory (that the *Διδαχὴ* uses the Western Acts) assumes Blass' view;¹ but certainly it gives a good explanation of the genesis of the *B* form.

We know that Hillel used the *A* form, and added that it contained the Law and the Prophets. Now in Matt. 7, 12 the second clause is οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, which seems to connect our Lord's saying with Hillel's, and so with the *A* form beyond all doubt.

¹ It would make the theory of the dependence of the *Διδαχὴ* on the Western Acts far easier, and perhaps render the assumption of Blass' view unnecessary, if we thought that the absence of this passage in Barnabas pointed to its absence in the 'Two Ways.'

At the same time the first clause in Matt. [πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιᾶτε αὐτοῖς] gives the characteristic phraseology of the *B* form, which therefore probably shows a reaction of the Evangelical wording on a Christian form of the negative saying. The *B* form therefore is Christian, and although it is certainly possible that the genesis of it is due to the earliest Christian redaction of the *Διδαχὴ*, it seems somewhat more probable that it is to be traced to the Acts, as it is almost incredible that St. Luke would wrest from its setting a saying of this kind and insert it into the Apostolic letter.

It is impossible to quote in support of this view the fact that the eucharistic part of the *Διδαχὴ* agrees with the Western² text of the third gospel, as this part probably belongs to a different stratum of the *Διδαχὴ*; but it certainly gives rise to the suspicion that the *Διδαχὴ* spent the early days of its growth in a locality which favoured the Western text.

In any case it seems highly probable that the chronological order of the *A* form, *B* form, and the Evangelical setting, is

1. Negative setting *A* form.
2. Evangelical positive setting.
3. Negative setting *B* form.

K. LAKE.

² The fact that the Western reading in St. Luke is probably a 'non-interpolation' according to W.H. has also an obvious bearing on the subject.

DIAERESIS AT EVERY FOOT IN LATIN HEXAMETER, PHALAECEAN AND CHOLIAMBIC VERSE.

VERSES in which the word-foot coincides largely or throughout with the verse-foot are rough and produce a prosaic effect. The classical writers generally avoided them. Yet such verses occur more frequently in Latin than is generally supposed.

I. In the *Hexameter*, e.g., as far as is known, but three examples have been cited, and all of these from one poet, Ennius, (cf. Luc. Mueller, *Re Metr.*² p. 218; Gleditsch, *Metrik d. Röm.* p. 173; Christ, *Metr. d. Gr. u. Röm.* § 220; Plessis, *Métrique Grec. et Lat.* § 24). To these three the following should be added:

A. Martial (Gilbert):—

(1) III., 76, 3:

Hic, rogo, non furor est, non haec est mentula demens?

(2) V., 82, 3:

An potes et non vis? Rogo, non est turpius istud?

(3) VI., 40, 3:

Haec erit hoc quod tu; tu non potes esse quod haec est.

(4) VI., 60, 9:

Nescio quid plus est, quod donat saecula chartis;

(5) X., 73, 9 :

Munere sed plus est et nomine gratius ipso.

(6) XI., 32, 1 :

Nec toga nec focus est nec tritus cimice lectus.

(7) XII., 6, 11 :

Non licet et fas est. Sed tu sub principe duro.

B. OVID :—

(8) *Epist.* XV., 309 :

Ut te nec mea vox nec te meus incitet ardor,

(9) *Remed. Am.* 283 :

Hic amor et pax est, in qua male vulneror una,

(10) *Remed. Am.* 481 :

Nam si rex ego sum, nec mecum dormiat ulla,

(11) *Trist.* II., 195 :

Longius hac nihil est, nisi tantum frigus et hostis,

(12) *Trist.* IV., 4, 75 :

Nec tamen hunc sua mors, nec mors sua terruit illum :

(13) *Trist.* V., 5, 21 :

Quatenus et non est in caro coniuge felix,

C. JUVENCUS :—

(14) I. 352 :

Nunc sine, nam decet hoc, sic sancta per omnia nobis.

D. Carmina Epigraphica (*Buecheler*).

(15) 461, 1 :

Suetrius Hermes hic situs est, cui Tertia coniunx.

(16) 720, 12 :

Omnibus his mox est de flammis tollere flammæ.

E. Anthologia Latina (*B. et R.*)

(17) I., 1² (p. 89), 21, 110 :

Haec labor haec ars est, hinc fulvum colligis aurum !

(18) I., 1² (p. 244), 286, 297 :

Cernere iam fas est, quod vix tibi credere fas est.

(19) II., 1 (p. 30), 486, 60 :

Angulus ut par sit quem claudit linea triplex,

NO. XCV. VOL. XI.

(20) II., 1 (p. 38), 489, 1 :

Omnia sunt bona : sunt, quia tu, bonus, omnia condis.

(21) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 4 :

Omnia nam, quæ sunt, a te sunt, te sine nil est.

(22) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 5 :

His sine tu, simul es pro cunctis his et in illis.

(23) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 6 :

His sine tu, quod es, es ; non hi sunt te sine quod sunt.

(24) II., 1 (p. 39), 489, 7 :

Ac nec id hi quod tu, nec tu quod hi, sed in illis.

(notice in (18) lengthening of quod by *h* following)

(25) II., 1 (p. 163), 716, 10 :

Audit quod non vult, qui pergit dicere quod vult.

It will be noticed that 17 out of the 25 have some form of *esse* in the arsis of the 3rd foot and that 11 of these have *est* ; that some verses are almost entirely composed of monosyllabic words notably No. 18.

If verses in which elision occurs (as II., 1 (p. 40), 489, 47 : At deus esse habet, etc.) were taken into consideration the above number would be considerably increased.

II. *Phalæcean*.—This variety of verse occurs in greatest numbers in Martial and Sidonius, 2048 in the former (not 2054, as Meyer gives it, *Sitzungsber., d. phil. class. der Akad. d. Wiss. zu München*, 1889, p. 208), and 1234 in the latter. Catullus ranks third with 495. In Martial, and also in Catullus, verses with a break at the end of every foot occur more frequently than is generally stated. Leutsch, *Philol.* X., 740, says that in Martial such verses are 'höchst selten.' Paukstadt, referring to the same poet, says, *De Mart. Catulli Imit.*, p. 29, that they occur but once (V., 20, 9), basing the statement upon the results of Leutsch's investigation. Friedlaender, *Martial*, I., p. 29, says, verses like V., 20, 9 occur 'sehr selten.' But at least 15 such verses occur in that poet :

(1) II., 4, 5 :

Quare non iuvat hoc quod estis esse ?

(2) II., 37, 1 :

Quidquid ponitur hinc et inde verris,

N

- (3) III., 73, 2 :
Et non stat tibi, Phoebe, quod stat illis,
(4) IV., 30, 5 :
Illam, qua nihil est in orbe maius,
(5) V., 20, 9 :
Campus, porticus, umbra, virgo, thermae,
(6) V., 24, 15 :
Hermes omnia solus et ter unus.
(7) VI., 17, 3 :
Tu si Furius ante dictus esses,
(8) VIII., 64, 17 :
Uno iam tibi non sat est in anno,
(9) VIII., 76, 7 :
Vero verius ergo quid sit, audi :
(10) X., 49, 4 :
Quisquam plumbea vina vult in auro ?
(11) X., 72, 4 :
Iam non est locus hac in urbe vobis ;
(12) XI., 75, 2 :
Tecum, Caelia, servus ; ut quid, oro.
(13) XII., 18, 14 :
Quem nec tertia saepe rumpit hora,
(14) XII., 34, 5 :
Et si calculus omnis huc et illuc
(15) XII. 75, 4 :
Mollis Dindymus est, sed esse non vult ;

A similar state of affairs exists in Catullus. Leutsch says such verses occur in that poet but once, namely in 42, 2 ; Paukstadt says only twice, adding the example 2, 9. This latter statement is adopted by Riese in his edition of *Catullus*, But five more cases occur in that poet :

- (1) 5, 7 :
Da mi basia mille, deinde centum,
(2) 26, 1 :
Furi villula vestra non ad Austri
(3) 40, 6 :
Quid vis ? qua libet esse notus optas ?
(4) 42, 3 :
Iocum me putat esse moecha turpis
(It will be noticed that 42, 2 was cited but the line just below it was overlooked).
(5) 58, 1 :
Caeli, Lesbia nostra, Lesbia illa.

Elsewhere 6 other examples have been noticed :

- (1) Priapea, 77, 8 (B.) :
Ergo qui prius usque et usque et usque
(2) Lampridius, p. 381 (Baehr. Frag.) :
Pulchrum quod vides esse nostrum regem,
(3) Lampridius, p. 382 (Baehr. Frag.) :
Pulchrum quod putas esse uestrum regem
(4) Prud., Peristeph. VI., 155 :
Blandum littoris extet inde murmur,
(5) Anthol., Lat. I., 1², 444, 2 :
Quam vos creditis esse, vita ; non est.
(6) Terent. Maur. 2548 (K.) :
Namque et iugiter usu saepe Sappho.

Meyer omits from his list of 5356 phalaecean verses the Priapea, 288 ; he says there are 175 in the Anthol. Lat. There are in all 213 (I. 1, has 168, II. 1, has 45). It may be noted also that Martial's 'Caesurlose' verses are 1 in 15 according to Meyer's own statistics, instead of 1 in 12, the number which he gives.

Friedländer, *Mart.* I., p. 29, also says that in Martial verses with a break at the end of each of the first 3 feet as in II., 6, 11 are very rare. At least 88 such verses occur : 8 in Bk. I., 6 in II., 2 in III., 8 in IV., 4 in V., 8 in VI., 12 in VII., 3 in IX., 11 in X., 10 in XI. and 16 in XII. With diaeresis at the end of each of the last 3 feet, 16 verses occur in Martial.

III. *Choliambic*.—As verses in this metre are much fewer in number compared with either of the other two kinds, fewer cases of diaeresis, of course, occur. I have found but one example and that in Catullus, 44, 21 :

Qui tunc vocat me cum malum librum legi.

None occurs in Martial, though a number are found with a break at the end of each of the first 4 feet or of each of the last 4 feet.

It is believed that in the case of the Phalaecean and Choliambic metres, the above list is complete, and that in the Hexameter there cannot, at least, be many more examples than those above cited.

EMORY B. LEASE.

University of Michigan.

THE FOURTH THESIS OF THE HOMERIC HEXAMETER.

THE law that lengthening by position is forbidden in this part of the verse, was formulated by Wernicke in his edition of Tryphiodoros (an epic poet of the school of Nonnos), see Schulze *Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 423, and Giseke, *Homerische Forschungen*, p. 146. Lists of exceptions are given by Hartel, *Hom. Studien*, 1² 87, Hilberg, *Princip der Silbenwägung*, p. 112 (though he does not acknowledge its validity for Homer, Hesiod, the Cyclic poets, Theognis, Simonides, Archestratus, Matron, and Theocritus), Giseke, *l.l.* p. 149 (instances for *Iliad* only): Schulze *l.l.* gives references to Gerhard, *Lectiones Apollonianae*, p. 148 and Nauck, *Mélanges gréco-romains* iv. 646. On *-v ἐφ.* forming position in thesis, see Buth, *Philol.* xxxix. Schulze points out that verses such as λ 629 (τὸ πρόσθεν) and such combinations as σὶν νῆι μελαίῃ are lawful.

I cannot understand why it should be very difficult to break the law. If one reads modern Greek hexameters, and then considers how very few exceptions are to be found among the 27,803 verses of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, one will hardly be inclined to agree with the view that it is all 'a matter of accident.' For instance, aorists of the form *τάνυσσαν* are common enough, and would follow very conveniently after the weak caesura in the third foot, as in *Dublin Translations*, p. 163,

οἱ ῥ' ἦτο κατὰ ἴσα τάνυσσαν φύλοπιν αἰνῆν

(a line which to my own ear sounds quite correct) but according to Giseke's list the whole *Iliad* does not supply a nearer parallel, than

Σ 400

χάλκεον δαίδαλα πολλά.

According to Giseke the *Iliad* in its 15,693 verses contains only 13 instances, including some repetitions, of a polysyllable so scanned before a non-enclitic word.

Mr. Agar's conjectures should show Prof. Tyrrell that he overrated the difficulty of violating the rule in question. Though *φ* rarely forms position in thesis, and though *Iliad* and *Odyssey* together supply only two instances (M 55, ω 240) of *-v ἐφ.* forming position in the 4th thesis, Mr. Agar proposes

δῶκεν Φοῖο δόμοιο,
σκήπτρ' ἦρχεν Φεῖπέ τε μῦθον.

Pape-Benseler, *Gr. Eigenn.*, have failed to notice that 'the name of the river was Titaresus,' and instead of ἀλύσκαε χ 330 being 'Wolf's reading for ἀλύσκαζε' the latter word is the reading of two MSS. only F Z, whereas all the rest and Apollonius Sophistes show ἀλύσκαε.

Whatever the truth about P 387, the context (ὀρώρει, νωλεμὲς αἰεὶ) makes an aorist very improbable.

As to the starting point of the discussion

H. Dem. 269

ἀθανάτοισι θνητοῖσιν ὄνειρα καὶ χάρμα τέτυκται,

I have not studied the hymn sufficiently to have any right to an opinion. Schulze, *Qu. Ep.* p. 228 accepts ὄνειρα < ὄνηρα, like φρέαρ < *φρήαρ (Hom. φρεῖατα). In view however of ἦρος v. 455 and φρεῖται or φρεῖται v. 99, it is hard to decide between ὄνειρα and ὄνειρα. It must be borne in mind that the -ει- is not diphthongal.

The reason for the limitation on lengthening by position in the 4th thesis, is the pause at the end of the fourth foot, according to Giseke, *H.F.* p. 146. It seems to me, however, that a pause rather assists lengthening than otherwise, and I should like to make the following suggestion. Lengthening by position of close vowels at the end of polysyllables is forbidden in the fifth thesis, and is exceedingly rare in the fourth; it is rare in the second and not very common in the first. But in these positions there is no such marked repugnance to lengthening by position within words. I conjecture that this points to the final consonants being shorter than the same sounds within words; I think one may notice the same thing in German. To me at least the nasal in -nd- sounds longer in 'ein wohlhabender Mann' than in 'wir haben das Buch.' Thus the -αντ- may have been really shorter in ἔδειμαν τέχος than in δέιμαντος. But even the second syllable of δέιμαντος must have been somewhat short of the full length of a thesis, viz. two short syllables, and ἔδειμαν τέχος was quite appreciably shorter. Hence such collocations were avoided in thesis. But altogether avoided they could not be, least of all in the first half of the verse. For the beginning of the sentence generally coincided with

the beginning of the line, and many common words had to be placed early in the sentence and, therefore, in the line. On these see Wackernagel, *Indogermanische Forschungen* I. p. 333, and Monro, *H.G.*² p. 335.

In the arsis, on the other hand, such lengthenings were much less objectionable, since there the standard was only *one* long syllable, and a long syllable is shorter than two short ones, *i.e.* the arsis is really shorter than the thesis. Hence the comparative frequency of short syllables doing duty in arsis, whereas they very rarely form a thesis. Indeed the chief restriction on their appearance in arsis is that the arsis must be the first or last syllable in a 'phrase,' to use a musical term. Perhaps the hexameter originated in a $\frac{3}{4}$ measure.

C. M. MULVANY.

THE rule, or so-called rule, in the Greek hexameter, that a syllable naturally short cannot be lengthened by position in the thesis of the fourth foot, is by no means a recent invention. It is at least as old as Gerhard, who in his *Lectiones Apollonianæ*, published in 1816,—in which he has done some good service to the text of Apollonius Rhodius—says (p. 147) that a spondee made such by position is avoided in the fourth foot, and he proceeds to give a reason, or what may pass as such, for the rule. His words are, 'neque solum si interpunctio fuit, sed etiam si gravitas quaedam numerorum apta videbatur, separato utebantur spondeo in quarta sede. Ut autem vere contineret vocem celerius currentem, gravi sua vi spondeus fiebat, non potuit sua vi vocem continere, sed properandum erat, ut fieret spondeus. Igitur vitabant spondeum externa vi, hoc est positione, effectum'—a fantastic reason enough. In consequence of this rule Gerhard in *Ap. Rh.* iii. 517

ὄρτο μέγα φρονέων, ἐπὶ δ' νῆες Τυνδαρείου

altered νῆες to νῆϊς, though the latter is a form not used by Apollonius. Again in iv. 978 he read

εἰδόμεναι χρυσέοισι κέρασι κυδιάσκον

where the codd. have χρυσέοισι κέρασσι. Brunnck had here corrected to χρυσέοις κέρασσιν with position made by ν ἐφέλκυστικόν. Wellauer (1828) on *Ap. Rh.* iii. 517, while recognising the rule, at the same time points out several violations of it in Homer and keeps νῆες, but he follows Gerhard in iv. 978. In iii. 517 Köchly (1850) con-

tured νῆες and is followed by Merkel. Rzach in his *Grammatische Studien zu Apollonios Rhodios*, (1878) follows Wellauer in keeping the text in this passage on the ground of the Homeric exceptions, and in iv. 978 follows Brunnck. It is clear then that this rule is acknowledged by German scholars or they would have felt no difficulty in retaining νῆες.

Whether such a rule is to be recognized or not is a question on which I express no opinion. It depends of course upon what proportion the exceptions bear to the examples. Mr. Agar has quoted many exceptions in Homer, and there are others which he has not referred to, viz. H 337, K 389, ω 240. However I quite agree with him that later Epic poets have observed metrical practices to which Homer does not conform, and to them this particular one may have been a rule. Thus there is only one more violation of the rule in Apollonius, besides the two I have named.

The limitation about the monosyllable, and when the consonant or consonants lengthening it are in the same word, is a refinement not mentioned by Gerhard or Wellauer. Perhaps this has been added by Hilberg, but I have not seen what he has written.

R. C. SEATON.

I FEEL very glad to have raised this question, as it seems likely now to get itself settled one way or the other. For myself I remain obstinate to all the arguments of Prof. Tyrrell and Mr. Agar, charm they never so wisely. And especially in regard to the *Hymns*; indeed it was in the *Hymns* that I said such licenses must not be admitted. Let us first settle the line that gave rise to all this tempest, *Hymn Dem.* 269. It must be admitted that there is no other violation of Hilberg's law in this hymn nor in any other with the exception of the two limping lines I quoted in my first note on the subject, both of them from quite short and worthless hymns and both atrociously bad lines. Are we then justified in introducing a solitary example into a hymn which, if nowhere very poetical, is at least very carefully versified? I hardly think many people will disagree with me in saying No, and I say it though I confess myself much tempted by Mr. Agar's restoration and should think his a very probable account of the corruption were there no metrical objection.

Now let us turn to the wider question. This is not, *pace* Prof. Tyrrell, 'Can a short

vowel resist position?' I protest that neither Hilberg nor I nor any one else ever said anything of the kind, and I wonder Prof. Tyrrell can accuse a respectable father of a family of such a thing. To put it better than I did before, I say that in a certain part of the line vowels naturally short are hardly ever found in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and practically not at all in later poets of any respectable skill, and among these later poets are the authors of the Homeric Hymns, but not Hesiod. To say that a short vowel can resist position would be to say that the syllable containing it can be scanned as a short syllable despite position.

But Prof. Tyrrell says this is not a law but a coincidence. He has by this time doubtless read Mr. Agar on the same subject; does he still think it is all the result of accident? Why, so natural is it that Mr. Agar wants to introduce it into more than twenty passages of Homer besides the dozen or so where we already have it. And then 'the spondee in the bucolic diaeresis is very rare,' and in fact there are so few of them that you would not expect any of them to have the last syllable naturally short. Why, there are at least twenty-five lines in the first book of the *Iliad*, after deducting every case where there can be any shadow of doubt, in which a hypermonosyllable with the last syllable naturally long precedes the diaeresis; say six hundred in the whole epic, and that is really much understated, I imagine; and there are somewhere about eight in the whole *Iliad* which offend against the law, and only two in the *Odyssey*! Is it chance that not one in a hundred of such words ends in a syllable naturally short? Thirdly 'the law rests on no principle but only what Bacon calls *nuda enumeratio*.' No principle I know of, be it so, but I do not know on what principle the law about the weak caesura in the fourth foot rests, or the law about the cretic in trimeters, or the law which forbids a molossus to stand before the diaeresis, or the law which makes a molossus with the first syllable resolved in the same position so rare in Homer, and so exceedingly rare in later epic writers that I believe there are only two instances of it in all Quintus Smyrnaeus, and not even one in Apollonius. Those laws also were arrived at by *nuda enumeratio*.

But my feelings carry me away; let us end in amity. For before taking leave of Prof. Tyrrell I should like to say that there is at least one person who believes as firmly in his *ἔσσο* at *Hermes* 33 as he can

himself, nor is it the only conjecture of his upon the Hymns which appears to me admirable.

Mr. Agar, as I have already had occasion to observe, takes up a very different standpoint. Admitting that violation of the law is excessively rare in our texts, he puts this down to the credit of late editors and would re-introduce it freely. I confess that I do not know whether he can be driven from this position, if he will modify the statement a little, though I by no means think him right. If he will modify, for as I understand him it was the critics contemporary with the later poets, as Apollonius,¹ who were the culprits. But by the time of Apollonius the text of Homer was practically fixed. Who then were they and of what age? Of the age of the Hymns, or somewhere between them and Apollonius? But until that is settled it is of no use to pursue the question further. And whoever they were, why did they not correct all that host of far more glaring metrical absurdities? Why did they leave *ἦ δ' ἄν* and *φίλε ἔκνυρ* *δευός τε* and the rest of them? Why, if they were about correcting this obscure detail at all, did they not correct *Δ 796* and *Π 38* from *ἄμα δ' ἄλλος* to *ἄλλος δ' ἄμα*? I don't believe the early Greeks purposely altered Homer at all; they looked on him as Dryden did on Chaucer, a prodigious genius of an unpolished age who never had the advantage of sitting at the feet of Mr. Waller.

Aristarchus either knew nothing of the rule, a hardly probable supposition when poets before and after him observe it, or flew in the face of it when he read *μέλαιναν* at *Φ 126*. To be sure he was caught in a cleft stick, for had he read *μελαίνῃ* he elided the dative *φριχί* to which he may have objected still more.

There is no time now at any rate to discuss all the interesting suggestions of Mr. Agar at *η 114* and elsewhere, for many of which there does certainly appear a great deal to be said, if he can establish his main theorem, but I cannot withhold my tribute of admiration for the celerity with which he has built and launched a new theory while I was looking round me, and the energy with which he has ransacked Homer to produce examples for my overthrow.²

¹ Apollonius himself of course obeys the Homeric law, allowing such lengthening in the case of monosyllables.

² I thought Mr. Agar would score a point off me for accepting Bentley's *παρίεσσαν* at *H 467*. I did so with the greatest hesitation and I now think I was wrong.

My own collections on the subject appear to have 'taken their endless way to the winds' twelve quarters,' but as well as I can remember he has not missed a single instance, despite his apologetic 'there may be more.' Assuming these then to be all the Homeric instances to be had, let us examine them a little more closely, taking what is at present the orthodox view.

It is always a safe rule in dealing with any Homeric question to take Grote's advice and begin with the *Odyssey*. And from the *Odyssey* what do we learn? As Mr. Agar rightly hints, we are to read περίφρων for περίφρον in the lines ending περίφρον Πηνελόπεια (compare περίφρων Εὐρύκλεια as a vocative). Then we have only two exceptions in 12,000 lines and these two are:

λ 338 : ξένος δ' αὐτ' ἐμός ἐστιν ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς.

ζ 93 : αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πλὺνάν τε κáθηράν τε ῥύπα πάντα.

Observe that in these two lines the law is hardly broken, if at all. For in the former it is not simply ἕκαστος but ἕκαστος δ' that precedes the diaeresis, and in the latter κáθηράν τε is practically one word as τε is enclitic. But admit them to be exceptions in the fullest sense; then you have one exception to every 6,000 lines, and if that does not prove a rule, what does? By the time the *Odyssey* was composed therefore the rule already was in force, and à fortiori it prevailed in the *Hymns*.

Did it then in the *Iliad*? Nine examples are quoted by Mr. Agar, but from what time do they date? That is the worst of it, one is sure to stumble sooner or later upon this accursed 'Homeric question.' But one thing is at once obvious from his list; three of them are out of the Catalogue. Removing these we have six in about 15,000 lines, a much higher proportion than in the *Odyssey*. Moreover three of the six are from the *Achilleid* according to Dr. Leaf. But look again at these six. O 189 is ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς over again, Δ 189, 796, Π 38 (the three Achillean examples) are all practically identical, τὸν δ' ἄλλον λαὸν ἀνῶχθω, ἅμα δ' ἄλλος, ἅμα δ' ἄλλον. Σ 400 is a bad line, for χάλκεον breaks two laws at once. M 20 is Κάρησός τε Ποδῖος τε, where again we find the enclitic τε as also in one of the Catalogue instances. The three best cases then are the Achillean, and how is it that all three are one formula? Mr.

Agar will say 'because an old formulaic line may be expected to exhibit no consciousness of any such rule,' and I daresay he may be right. But to go no further into this matter, was I not justified in saying that the instances are too few and too uncertain to warrant us in introducing another into a hymn in which there are none at all?

However I return to the Catalogue. This is allowed to be connected with the Boeotian school, and so with Hesiod. It is interesting therefore to observe that Hesiod and the Catalogue are the strongholds in which the impugnors of the law can best find refuge. Look at *Theogony* 287, 325, 339, 340, *Shield* 395, *Works* 721, 778, *frag.* (Rzach) 25, 148 (?), 155.

In no hexameters later than this is the law not observed so far as I know. Even works so bad in technique as the Orphic *Argonautica* obey it. The case of Quintus Smyrnaeus is perhaps as instructive as any can be; in the Tauchnitz edition you will find four violations, ii. 206, x. 73, xii. 314, xiv. 443 (besides xii. 65 where the offending word is only a monosyllable and has been long ago corrected). Two of the four are emendations! Another was corrected by Wernicke, who is followed by Spitzner, Lehrs, Köchly and Zimmermann, and in the latter's text there now remains only one. And this in an author whose versification is not very delicate, and who, whatever Zimmermann may say, is anything but 'Ὀμηρικώτατος rebus metricis.'

Finally βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη. If Mr. Agar will look at Mr. Monro's *Homeric Grammar* § 116, he will see that the evidence for the long ī is quite independent of Hilberg's law, though of course this law in its turn reinforces the argument that the last syllable was long by nature. But γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη? Well, I infer that that was a later phrase. And indeed when I look at that βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη with its long ī, and the long ā of πότνια, and the ancient religious significance of βοῶπις, I feel as if it were a fossil of some unknown creature that calls up visions of a whole vanished world. There it lies embedded in strata who knows how many centuries later, speaking of generation after generation of poets already using the hexameter and preparing the path for the rising of the *Achilleid* with that glorious exordium which remains the highest of all preludes as it is the first we know, ὡς πῦρ δ' αἰθόμενον ἢ ἥλιον ἀνιόντος.

ARTHUR PLATT.

THE PYLOS AND SPHACTERIA QUESTION.

I VERY much doubt whether the controversy between Mr. Burrows and myself can be of very engrossing interest to the world in general. Still I should wish, if the editor of the *Classical Review* will allow me, to correct one or two errors which Mr. Burrows has made in his lengthy and somewhat polemical criticism of my paper, and also to repudiate the meanings which he has been kind enough to attribute to certain statements of mine.

In the first place I suspected when I read Mr. Burrows' original contribution to the *Hellenic Journal* that he was inclined to give to topography in relation to Ancient History an emphasis far greater than that which I should be disposed to allot to it. That it may contribute largely to our knowledge of the subject I, of course, believe; otherwise I should not give time and trouble to it: but I am also persuaded that the conclusions to be drawn from it cannot be by any means so detailed as some of those which Mr. Burrows has drawn from the evidence he obtained at Pylos, and are subject to far stricter limitations than those which he would assign to them. Mr. Burrows would like to separate the topographical from the historical evidence, and is apparently quite angry with me for not adopting this excellent but wholly impracticable plan. For instance, with reference to my estimate of the former breadth of the entrance from the bay into the lagoon he says '(Mr. Grundy) has placed the western end of the sandbar where he places it, for no other reason than because such a state of things fits in with his preconceived theory as to the Spartan defence of the harbour, and is not incompatible with the geological probabilities.'

This is a form of accusation to which any comparison between topography and history must expose the maker. At the same time had Mr. Burrows read more carefully the paper which he criticises he would have seen:—

(1) That the breadth I have allotted to the channel is only put forward as a very approximate estimate.

(2) That the so-called preconceived theory is founded on the whole story as given by Thucydides and not merely on those detached fragments of it on which Mr. Burrows appears to rely.

Throughout the whole of his paper Mr.

Burrows seems to think that I put forward my conclusions as though I considered them to be fully ascertained. In this he is mistaken. Still had he seemed to me to give a correct representation of the evidence I adduced, I should have been quite willing to let the original papers and the replies stand. As it is I am unwilling to allow readers of the *Classical Review*, who may not have seen the *Hellenic Journal*, to suppose that I made use of the sort of argument which Mr. Burrows attributes to me.

I. *The Final Struggle on Sphacteria.*

Mr. Burrows is glad to see that I have considerably altered my position with regard to the Spartan defence of the summit of the Island. I cannot understand what gives him this impression. I hold and have always held since I saw the ground that the Spartans were posted round the summit on the arc of a segment somewhat greater perhaps than a semicircle, of which the cliff from the summit into the little hollow formed the straight side, and that along the main cliff, into this hollow, and up this small cliff the Messenians made their way. As to the actual path by which they arrived at the hollow, I have already said that it is ultra-refinement of topography to attempt to indicate it in detail, and have pointed out that Mr. Burrows' theory involves a supposition directly at variance with the account given by Thucydides. Mr. Burrows gets over the difficulty by supposing a path from the Panagia along the foot of the cliffs, no trace of even the possibility of which can be shown at the present day.

I need hardly say that the remark of Mr. Tozer to which he refers is nothing more than the suggestion of a possibility.

I confess that I am wholly unable to determine the exact position which Mr. Burrows would assign to the Spartans: but, as far as I can make out, he seems to think that they were in occupation of the little hollow from the very first beginning of the fight at the summit, or, at any rate, were defending the northern outlet of it.¹

I can only say that, if this fairly represents Mr. Burrows' view, I do not see how in that case the first few Messenians could have arrived at the south end of the little hollow without being immediately discovered

¹ *J.H.S.* 60, 61.

and cut down by the Spartan troops stationed in it. There could at any rate have been no fatal surprise.

I incline to the view that it was from the south end of the hollow that the Messenians arrived, but I think that Thucydides' story of the surprise becomes quite inexplicable if there were any Spartan troops in the hollow itself. The rational explanation seems to be that in all probability the Spartans at the summit had good reason to suppose that no one could get into it undiscovered, and that therefore any possible attack from this very difficult side could be easily warded off by lining the low cliff, should the necessity for so doing arise. What the Messenians apparently did was to get into it unobserved, by some wholly unsuspected way, and hence they succeeded in gaining the actual summit by scaling the low cliff before the Spartans could provide for its defence.

As to the *παλαιὸν ἔργον*, I have accepted Mr. Burrows' reidentification of Dr. Schliemann's discovery, and I have never had any doubt as to its having stood on the site indicated, Thucydides' evidence on this point being peculiarly clear. At the same time I shall retain my caution with regard to the care which must be exercised in drawing distinction between certain kinds of rock formation existent on Sphacteria and the earliest examples of wall work.

A fair example of the misunderstanding of my views which is so unfortunately frequent in Mr. Burrows' paper is afforded by his reference to the supposed remains on Hagio Nikolo. Mr. Burrows speaks of 'the Nestorian remains which he (Mr. Grundy) claims to have discovered on Hagio Nikolo.'

The addition of the word 'Nestorian' begs the question. I never made such a claim. I said expressly that 'there cannot be any certainty about the site until excavation has been done.'¹

II. The S.E. Corner of Pylos.

I have read Mr. Burrows' argument on this point carefully several times, and I confess I do not wholly understand its constructive side; so I will simply deal with it in so far as it is destructive.

Referring to the south end of the east cliff of Pylos, Mr. Burrows says² 'the rise of the ground at any rate never approaches the perpendicular,' a statement which he supports by an extremely disparaging reference

to the illustration which he inserted with his own paper. He does not even do his illustration justice. He says that in it 'the sandbar is regarded as non-existent,'³ whereas the beginning of it is plainly shown on the right edge of the picture in the form of a light patch in the engraving. I do not know, of course, what Mr. Burrows means by 'never approaching the perpendicular.' I see that at this south end of the east cliff, the summit of the cliff rises to a vertical height of 60 feet above its eastern foot, which is only at a horizontal distance of 81 feet from that summit. This slope moreover is not continuous, but in part much steeper than that implied by these general measurements; in fact, if I recollect aright, the lower part is perpendicular cliff, with a slope from the top of the cliff to the 60 ft. level. Anyone who realises what this really means in nature will understand that Mr. Burrows' remark is highly misleading.

Mr. Burrows then proceeds to talk of survey defeating its own object if it supersedes observation.⁴ Is he under the impression that surveying instruments act automatically? Is he not aware that a survey implies an enormous series of observations which have to be made with the greatest care, since one error may mean the loss of a day's work? Is he aware that every change of slope requires a new reading of the angle for contouring purposes? How can survey supersede observation, when it is itself nothing else save the record of observation aided by instruments of accuracy?

As to the path round the south end of the cliff, Mr. Burrows accuses me of forgetfulness as to its existence.⁵ The forgetfulness, or rather oversight, is Mr. Burrows' own. I refer to it on p. 17 of my original article in very definite terms.⁶ There is just room for the path and nothing more: but in my case, the matter is not of vast importance in view of the evidence of that south part of the east cliff having been washed by the sea in comparatively recent times.⁷ This also disposes of the main objection which Mr. Burrows makes as to the position of the south wall of defence as given on my map (wall BB.). As to this wall not having been on the actual shore, the facts given by Thucydides are quite sufficient to show this, viz.

(1) ἐχούρει ἕξω τοῦ τείχους ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.⁸

³ *C.R.* p. 2, note 6.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 3.

⁶ *J.H.S.* p. 17, also *ibid.* p. 5.

⁷ *Ibid.* p. 10.

⁸ Thuc. iv. 9, 2.

¹ *J.H.S.* p. 49, ad *fin.*

² *C.R.* p. 2.

(2) καὶ τὰς τριηρεῖς αἵπερ ἦσαν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῶν καταλειφθεῖσων ἀνασπάσας ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος μαπροσεσταύρωσε.¹

We may conjecture, too, from what Thucydides tells us, that Demosthenes never regarded this wall as a really practicable line of defence, and possibly never completed it.

What Mr. Burrows means by an attack by land on the south side of Koryphasion² I do not see, except that he seems to postulate the existence of low ground, now the western extremity of the sandbar, to the east of the south end of the east cliffs of Koryphasion.³ The evidence, in so far as it exists, is all against this postulate.

He is kind enough to present me with an argument against himself. I do not require it. The state of the cliffs and of the sandbar is evidence enough. I dealt with both in my first article.⁴

Mr. Burrows derives an argument from the present position of the emissaries.

In the first place they are all artificial at the present day. In the second place the two he mentions were made through the higher part of the sandbar several hundred yards from Koryphasion, because if made at the lower part of the sandbar close under the cliffs they have a tendency to become choked by the sand from the bank which is forming at the inner end of the Sikia Channel. That is what had happened with regard to the one which is shown on my map running half-way through the sandbar near Koryphasion.

Mr. Burrows fails to understand how Demosthenes could have beached his ships on the south-west shore of Koryphasion. He thinks the statement astounding, and apologises for me by supposing it to be an oversight. And yet Mr. Burrows allows the Peloponnesian vessels to get near enough in shore, even during the stress and confusion of battle, for them to be able to use their ἀποβάθραι. If they could do this under such circumstances, I do not see how it should be so astounding that Demosthenes at certain places on the same stretch of shore should have been able to draw up his vessels when there was no one to hinder him.

Mr. Burrows and I differ as to the place at which the Spartans proposed to attack by engines. He suggests his supposititious slope or low land at the south-east corner of Koryphasion. He imagines that a wall

running down to the end of the cliff on the Sikia Channel must have been the proposed object of attack. I have already shown that the existence of the piece of land he postulates is contrary to the evidence obtainable. But suppose that that low land had been in existence, the Peloponnesians could only have got at the last few yards of the wall close to the channel, and had they knocked that down they would only have opened a passage a few yards wide, which a few men could have defended against enormously superior numbers. Surely it would be more natural for them to assail the north wall, which in the position in which I conjecture it to have stood was easily assailable by engines, as Mr. Burrows admits.

I have nothing to add to or to subtract from my explanation of τὸ κατὰ τὸν λιμένα τεῖχος in the *Hellenic Journal*. As to the word ἀπόβασις, Mr. Burrows' criticism is evidently founded mainly on a misreading of what I have said in my original paper.⁵

Turning to the question of the position of the north wall, Mr. Burrows leaves the difference between us in much the same state as it was before. I see, however, that he has considerably modified his views with regard to certain details. In his reply to my criticism, he utterly ignores the two most important factors,

(1) The enormous superiority of the attacking force;

(2) The fact that an attacking party can choose the point of attack.

I am very strongly of opinion that the wall to whose remains he points, was some hurried structure run up in connection with the defence of the summit of Koryphasion, a very different object from the defence of the whole promontory.

On the lagoon question I have nothing to add to what I have already said, save that Mr. Burrows' accusation of an attempt on my part at dating its progress of formation is quite unwarranted by anything I have said on the subject.

Mr. Burrows refers to the modification which I have thought it necessary to make in my view as to the channels which were blocked.⁶ I freely admit that I missed in the first instance what seems to me to be the fairly obvious explanation of this very obscure point in a very obscure question. Nor do I think that those who have read Thucydides' narrative very closely, and can form an estimate of the very complicated nature of the factors involved in the

¹ *Ibid.* iv. 9, 1.

² *C.R.* p. 3.

³ *V.* again in *J.H.S.* p. 10.

⁴ *J.H.S.* p. 12, *ad fin.*

⁵ *Vide. J.H.S.* p. 29, *ad fin.*

⁶ *V.* end of this article.

explanation of any part of it, will feel much surprise that I have had in this section to amend the bill. I rejected the original theory on my own criticism of the story as a whole.

But had Mr. Burrows confined himself to re-killing this dead Voithio Kilia theory, he would have avoided a serious error. He proceeds however to attack the amended view that the channels blocked were the entrances into the lagoon harbour, (1) via the outer part of the Sikia Channel from the sea, (2) via the inner part of the same channel from the bay. He says 'If the object of the Spartans was to prevent the Athenians from getting into the inner harbour, why did they not block the mouth of that harbour itself?' etc. He then adds 'But can Mr. Grundy point me out in this case a single advantage?' viz. in the blocking of the two channels, as compared with the blocking of the lagoon entrance. Of course I can, and so can anyone else who reads Thucydides' text. If there is one point with regard to the views of the Spartans on which Thucydides lays peculiar stress it is that they were deeply convinced of the necessity of maintaining the communication with their men on the Island. Had they left the Sikia open, the communication would have been either cut, or rendered very difficult, so soon as the Athenian fleet arrived.¹

Mr. Burrows argues at considerable length for the superiority of his theory with regard to the channels over my own. According to him the blocking of the harbour entrances was a wild impossibility. Yet Thucydides, as his repeated and detailed assertions show, believed the thing to be possible. All this Mr. Burrows rejects in order to establish a theory founded on the fact that fifty, the number of the Athenian fleet, may be without difficulty divided into two parts having to one another the ratio of two to eight.

He inserts at this point of his argument a note. It is with reference to Thucydides' words *ἐν τῷ λιμένι οὖσας τὰς ναῦς καὶ οὐκ ἐκπλεούσας*.² He says:—

'Thuc. iv. 13, 3. Mr. Grundy *J.H.S.* p. 30-32, apparently thinks *ἐν τῷ λιμένι* refers to the ships blocking the eastern of the two channels. Here, then, even the first informant used *λίμην* in a double sense! For these ships were not in the inner harbour.'

Of course they were not. That is exactly the point. But Mr. Burrows has not even taken the trouble to note that I said ex-

pressly in dealing with the two divisions of the story, 'The first part . . . closes at the end of the first section of the thirteenth chapter.'³ Consequently the informant was not the first informant at all but the second.

The other points raised in his article have been discussed in my previous articles, and repetition of the arguments would require more space and time than I have at my disposal.

G. B. GRUNDY.

I append herewith the revised view as to the blocking of the straits, to which reference is made in Mr. Burrows' paper.

Addendum, October 1896.

The foregoing paper (that in the *J.H.S.* of April 1896) was written eight months ago. It is one thing to reconsider one's views while still in the MS. stage; it is another to examine them when they appear in the cold impersonality of print. The intense complication of the subject made me somewhat anxious as to the result of the latter examination. Having now made it, I may say that I am prepared to abide by all that I have written on the many points of the narrative—with one exception: I should wish to modify the view expressed as to the explanation of the difficulties with regard to the blocking of the channels. Those who have read the paper will see that I believe that there was a solid foundation of actual fact beneath the express statement made on this point by Thucydides. In the paper I have stated my belief that the characteristics of the mouth of the Voithio-Kilia and the Sikia Channel contribute this basis, and that probably both of these were blocked, the latter both inside and out. On reconsideration I would modify this expression of opinion. I am inclined to think that the reasons for blocking the Voithio-Kilia are inadequate, and that, in fact, the blocking of the Sikia inside and out is the true explanation of the difficulty—in other words that the Peloponnesian fleet intended to block the entrance of the Lagoon harbour, which entrance the topographical evidence obtainable on the spot, and given in the paper, shows to have existed in its most recent form at the Pylos end of the sandbar

¹ *J.H.S.* p. 74 etc.

² *C.E.* p. 9, note 3.

³ *J.H.S.* p. 42.

right under the south portion of the east cliff of Pylos (now Palaeo-Kastro). The estimate I have formed of the condition of things at the time will be found marked in Plate II. of the maps.

That the blocking of the Sikia was part of the design in the blockade of Pylos I think there can be no doubt. If any one does doubt the fact, let him remove this

factor from the problem, and he will then see the enormous mass of difficulties which the removal would involve. Every mistake or difficulty (and there are many of the latter) in Thucydides' account, with the exception of the length attributed to Sphacteria, is ultimately traceable to his failure to recognise the existence of *two* harbours.

PLATO, SYMPOSIUM, 179 C.

ALTHOUGH the words that I would endeavour here to correct occupy but a small space, I quote the passage in which they occur (*symp.* 179 B—D) in extenso, in order plainly to show them in their proper connection:—

καὶ μὴν ὑπεραποθνήσκουσιν γε μόνοι ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἐρώντες, οὐ<χ> [μόνον] ὅτι <οἱ> ἄνδρες, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες. τοῦτον δὲ καὶ ἡ Πελοπόννησος ἑλκυστὶς ἱκανὴν μαρτυρίαν παρέχεται ἱπὲρ τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐβέλυσσασα μόνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν ὄντων αὐτοῖ πατρός τε καὶ μητρός, οὓς ἐκείνη τοσοῦτον ὑπερεβάλετο τῇ φιλίας διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα ὥστ' ἀποδείξει αὐτοὺς ἄλλοτριούς ὄντας τῷ νείῳ καὶ ὀνόματι μόνον προσήκοντας. καὶ τοῦτ' ἐργασαμένη τὸ ἔργον οὕτω καλὸν ἔδοξεν ἐργάσασθαι οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ θεοῖς ὥστε πολλῶν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἐργασαμένων εὐαριθμήτοις δὴ τισιν ἔδοσαν τοῦτο γέρας οἱ θεοί, ἐξ Ἰδίου ἀνιέναι¹ πάλιν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλ' α<ὐ> τὴν ἐκείνην² ἀνείσαν ἀγασθέντες τῷ ἔργῳ· οὕτω καὶ θεοὶ τὴν περὶ τὸν ἔρωτα σπουδὴν τε καὶ ἀρετὴν μάλιστα τιμῶσιν. Ὀρφεία δὲ τὸν Οἰάγρον ἀτελῆ ἀπέπεμψαν ἐξ Ἰδίου φάσμα δείξαντες τῆς γυναικὸς ἐφ' ἣν ἦκεν,

¹ ἀνείναι MSS., em. Alexander Hommel in ed. *Symp.* Lipsiae 1834.

² ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκείνης MSS. et. edd.

αὐτὴν δὲ οὐ δόντες, ὅτι μαλθακίζεσθαι ἐδόκει αὐτῇ ὡς κιθαρωιδὸς καὶ οὐ τολμᾶν ἕνεκα τοῦ ἔρωτος ἀποθνήσκειν ὥσπερ Ἀλκρηστis, ἀλλὰ διαμνηχασθαι ζῶν εἰσιέναι εἰς Ἰδίου.

Hommel's correction of ἀνείναι to ἀνείσαι, which had forced itself upon me before I knew that he had made it, seems inevitable; albeit it has met with little or no favour with subsequent editors. The traditional reading is easily explained as due to the following ἀνείσαν.

As to the change that I would propose the following points must be noticed. First, there is a sharp antithesis implied between εὐαριθμήτοις—ψυχὴν and αὐτῆς (following the vulgate)—τῷ ἔργῳ: secondly, this antithesis is not expressed by the vulgate: thirdly, the position of τὴν ψυχὴν indicates that in the antithetical clause we should have a term contrasted with it; but τὴν ἐκείνης (sc. ψυχὴν) will not suffice. We gain help from the story of Orpheus where φάσμα and αὐτή, 'the real woman herself,' are contrasted. Reading αὐτὴν ἐκείνην we have the woman herself as σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴ contrasted with the mere ψυχή.

MORTIMER LAMSON EARLE.

Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania.

NOTE ON TERENCE ADELPHI LINE 415 (DZIATZKO), AND PLAUTUS MOSTELLARIA 805 SQQ.

HORACE appears to have this passage in mind as he writes *Satire* 1, 4, 105 sqq. as noticed by Dz. In *Ep.* 1, 5, 23 he seems to have l. 428 before him. Demea in 415 says, 'I bring up my son to see himself reflected in the light of other people's lives as in a mirror and to take an example from the lives

of others.' Syrus parodies this, replacing Demea's lofty abstractions by concrete instances drawn from the repertoire of the cook: 'I tell my fellow slaves that it is their business to mend their ways: and I do this by holding up to them instances of failures or successes in certain dishes which

they have prepared.' But in at least two out of the three epithets employed in l. 425 a *double entente* is plain, 'Hoc salsum est,' This is too salt, and this is a smart stroke (salsum erit quod non insulsum. Cic.) and lautum 'cleaned' and 'refined'—it seems not improbable that some similar double meaning lurks in adustum too.

In Plautus *Mostellaria* 805 sqq. the dialogue between Tranio on the one hand and Theopropides and Simo on the other is a sustained series of witty *double ententes*. Tranio points slyly to the old men looking at the house which Theopropides fancies that his son has bought and says:—

Age specta postes quouis modi!
Quanta firmitate facti et quanta crassitudine!

i.e. 'you see these old timber-skulls how hopelessly dense and thick they are.' In 811 Theo. says: 'They are even worse than I took them for.' Tranio. 'How so?' Theo. 'Because they are actually worm-eaten (crazy) already'—ab infumo refers to their gouty feet. 814 means, 'And even now they are sufficiently good-natured for me to take them in if they are only cleverly led on'—'pice' is an ἀποσπρόδικτρον. *Connivere* is a word meaning to 'adhere closely,' but Tranio means it to be understood by the audience in the sense of 'how they close their eyes!' *Arte* means both *closely* and *by my art*. The difference of quantity in the final *e* does not affect the rhythm.

H. A. STRONG.

Liverpool Univ. Coll.

BRENOUS ON HELLENISMS IN LATIN.

Étude sur les Hellenismes dans la Syntaxe Latine, par J. BRENOUS. Paris, C. Klincksieck. 1895. 8vo. Pp. 445.

THIS book, dedicated to Max Bonnet, and probably in some degree inspired by him, has found a sympathetic reader in the present reviewer, who himself believes that a strong inductive influence was exerted by the Greek language upon the Latin, and that this influence has been very generally underestimated. The cumulative effect of the evidence here collected is considerable, and the main conclusions are likely to commend themselves to unprejudiced scholars. The author does not hold a brief, nor is he at pains to make out the largest possible number of 'hellenismes.' With admirable candour he considers each case, or alleged case, by itself, and not infrequently renders a decision adverse to the Hellenistic claim. In fact this scrupulous balancing of evidence sometimes makes on the reader the impression of irresolution. We may instance the treatment of the 'dative by attraction' (p. 191).

M. Brenous' attitude toward the main question may be briefly stated as follows. Very few turns of construction are consciously and directly adopted from the Greek. Most Hellenisms are extensions, under Greek influence, of idioms already existing in Latin,—extensions, however, which the language, if left to itself, would probably not have made. We are not sure

that the author would admit any downright, unprepared Hellenisms whatsoever. Still we infer from his language that he would recognize as such the genitive without *filius* (*Hasdrubal Gisgonis*), the genitive absolute, the genitive with interjections (*foederis heu taciti*), phrases like *ait fuisse, sensit delapsus, statim (eiθis) creati, quippe (āre) reuisens*, and perhaps a few other expressions. But in general he seems almost eagerly solicitous to establish some Latin connexion for each Graecizing phrase. Here and there this zeal has led him further than we can follow. It is not apparent that anything is gained by attaching the palpably Greek expression *est mihi uolenti* to *est mihi gaudio* or to *insperanti mihi accidit*. And is there any real link between the dative with *idem* and the same case with *similis*? Like Madvig and others the author bridges the way to the gerundive of purpose, *Aegyptum proficiscitur cognoscendae antiquitatis*, in which he rightly sees a Greek idiom, by *naues deiciendi operis missae* (Caesar) and *exercitum opprimundae libertatis habet* (Sallust). To us it is not so clear that in these and like expressions the gerundive really belongs with the noun. May not these be the earliest examples of the full-fledged Hellenism? In like manner Brenous' Latin analogies for *cernere erat* (ἦν ἰδέν) seem very remote.

As further samples of the locutions which M. Brenous refers to Greek influence, may be mentioned the vocative in *seu Iane*

libentius audis, the genitive in *sermonis füllebar*, *tristitiæ dissoluere*, *regnauit populi*, *uacuis caedis*, *laeta laborum*, *integer uitæ*; the dative in *pugnare puellæ*, *it clamor caslo* (based on the Homeric *Ἀἰδὶ ποταμῶν* and the like); the accusative in *tremis artus*, *currere stadium*, *Iovem lapidem iurare*, *seruitutem seruire* (he does not make it quite clear what he thinks of *noxam nocuerunt* in the fœtal formula, Liv. ix. 10, 9), *vincere Isthmia*, *saltare Cyclopa*, *dulce ridentem*, *cernis acutum*, *femur tragula ictus*, *indutus pallam*, *suspensi loculos lacerto*, *inscripti nomina regum*, *exigor portorium*. Likewise the infinitive in *populare uenimus*, *egit uisere montes*, *bibere institutæ* (about *dare bibere* he hardly commits himself), *da uirginitate frui*; with *amo* (*φίλω*) in both senses (*tecum uiuere anem* and *perrumpere amat saxa*); in *nobilis superare*, *fruges consumere nati* (*πεφύκότες*), *maior uideri* (*μέγας ἦν ὀράσθαι*, *πάσσοινα θῆκεν ἰδέσθαι*); many uses of the substantive infinitive, as *istud uiuere triste*, *amasse meum*; furthermore the infinitive in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse. So too the imperfect indicative in *non tu corpus eras* (*οὐκ ἄρ' ἦσθα*), and the gnomic perfect (*deduxit*, Hor. Epist. i. 2, 48). The author also recognizes the Greek optative as one of several agencies co-operating in the development of the subjunctive of repetition (*si quis...prehenderetur*, *consensu militum eripiebatur*).

At certain points one might incline to go further than M. Brenous has gone. In discussing the partitive genitive he admits as Graecisms *prima* (*τὰ πρῶτα*) *uirorum* but not *strata uiarum*, *sancta dearum* but not *expediti militum*. This may possibly be right, but surely *Phocidis Elatia* does not find its justification, as a pure Latin expression, in Caesar's *Durocortorum Remorum* (p. 102). So in regard to the 'dative of relation' (*oppidum primum uenientibus ab Epiro*) he expresses himself, we think, too timidly. On the other hand, we do not fully share M. Brenous' assurance of Hellenistic influence in the dative of the agent with passive verbs, and we likewise hesitate to ascribe to Greek imitation the indicative in indirect questions, the indicative in subordinate clauses of indirect discourse, and the use of the participle in *-rus* without *est* to express intention. Nor are we yet prepared to see in apodotes such as *poteram*, or *uiceramus* (with following *si nisi*) a reminiscence of the Greek indicative of unreality. The Greek model which the author proposes for phrases like *nominandi istorum copia* is itself a rarity, and the analogy

more than doubtful. We fear that the explanation of this puzzling syntax must be sought elsewhere. Still less can we follow M. Brenous in his treatment of the perfect infinitive used for the present. It is a pity that, with his wide reading, he had not known the exhaustive study of this subject by A. A. Howard in the first volume of Harvard Studies, in which the development of this idiom is skilfully traced. His conclusions, we are confident, would have been materially modified. The notion that this perfect infinitive somehow represents the Greek aorist, so that *fecisse* is a clumsy translation—or mistranslation—of *ποιῆσαι*, has always seemed to us particularly unhappy. Were Roman boys not taught by their Greek masters to distinguish between *ποιῆσαι* 'to do,' and *ποιῆσθαι* 'to have done'?

In a somewhat elaborate Introduction, M. Brenous undertakes, from the analogy of modern languages, to show the probability *a priori* that Latin would be influenced by Greek in other ways than by mere word-borrowing. He describes the influence of French on German, of English (in Canada) on French, and so on. Of course he is entirely right in this; the wonder is that any one can doubt it. The most superficial observer of modern European languages must know how imitation of the phrases and idioms of another tongue—particularly one of superior culture—has everywhere been a most potent factor. All in their earlier stages have been moulded by the Latin, many by the French. A luculent example is the modern Greek of Athenian newspapers, often little else than a tissue of French and English phrases expressed in Greek words. That Greek, standing in the relation to Latin in which we know it did, should not have influenced Latin similarly, is simply inconceivable. It might be said against M. Brenous that his illustrations from modern languages seldom show changes of formal syntax. In fact he sometimes appears to lose sight of this distinction. But the distinction is after all not essential. The adoption of foreign syntax comes about, if at all, through the adoption of concrete, specific phrases. It is these phrases that are actually borrowed. *Ἡδὺ γέλασαν* produced *dulce ridere*, *ὀξύ βλέπειν* produced *cernere acutum*. These in turn begot other expressions embodying the new syntactical feature. In ways like this, even syntax may be affected by foreign influences. M. Brenous justly regards the habit of literal translation, in and out of school, as responsible for many of these

borrowings. The Augustan poets, with Livy and Tacitus, betray the strongest Greek influence, but he refuses to concede that even Plautus is entirely free from it.

We must point out, in justice to the author, that notwithstanding the considerable number of idioms in which he detects the imitation of Greek structure, his fundamental principles do not differ much from those held by other recent grammarians. The dictum of Schmalz (Müller's Handbuch ii.² p. 423), 'in allen diesen Konstruktionen hat man demnach keine Gräzismen zu suchen, sondern echt lateinische Wendungen, deren Entstehung sich psychologisch

sehr leicht erklären lässt . . . Dass hiebei die Anklänge an die griechischen Vorbilder mitbestimmend gewesen sein mögen, liegt auf der Hand und kann nicht bestritten werden,' might, barring its contradictory phraseology, almost pass for M. Brenous' own statement. The question of 'Hellenism' is often, we see, one of name rather than of fact. In conclusion let us reaffirm our favourable judgment of this work. The six francs which it costs will be a good outlay for any student of Latin syntax.

F. D. ALLEN.

Harvard University, August 1896.

THE WORKS OF HIPPOCRATES.

Hippocratis Opera Quae feruntur Omnia.

Vol. i. Recensuit HUGO KUEHLEWEIN. (Bibl. Script. Graec. et Rom. Teub.). Lipsiae, Teubner. 1895.

Prolegomena Critica in Hippocratis operum quae etc. (ut sup.). Scripsit JOHANNES ILBERG. Lipsiae, Teubner. 1894.

Hippocrates, Sammtliche Werke. Ins deutsche uebersezt und ausführlich commentirt von Dr. ROBERT FUCHS. Erster Band. Munich Lüneburg. 1895. (Pr. M. 8. 50).

Das Hippocrates-Glossar des Erotianos und seine ursprüngliche Gestalt. Von JOHANNES ILBERG, (abhl. d. phil.-hist. Classe d. K. Sachs. Ges. d. Wissenschaft). Bd. xiv. Leipzig, Hirzel. 1893.

THESE important works upon the Hippocratic writings should have been noticed some time ago; to plead that many engagements have prevented me from reading them carefully may serve as an explanation but, I fear, not as an excuse. Some little delay indeed was due to the expectation of a second volume of the editions of Kuehlewein and of Fuchs, as a better judgment may be given upon larger instalments of such works. The first work on the list is a new edition of the Hippocratic scriptures by Kuehlewein; to which are prefixed brief prolegomena by Ilberg and the editor: the second entry on the list is but a separate impression of Ilberg's contribution in pamphlet form. There is room for a new edition of Hippocrates; though perhaps from the linguistic point of view rather than from that of the substance. Before the appearance of Littré's Edition the only one of

considerable importance was that of Foesius, which was founded upon Cornarius but very far excelled it. The best edition of Foesius is that of Geneva 1657. Littré brought to the study of these books all that scholarly industry and acuteness, reinforced by the learning of an accomplished physician, could achieve: but Littré did not aim at the production of an edition containing all the various readings of the sources of the text; exact Greek scholarship was not the strong feature of his admirable edition, and his attention was given somewhat exclusively to the beautiful MSS. in Paris.

The volume before me contains the following books:—Περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἰητρικῆς, Περὶ ἀέρων ἰδῶρων τόπων, Προγνωστικόν, Περὶ διαίτης ὁξέων, Περὶ διαίτης ὁξέων νόθα, Ἐπιδημιῶν Α, Ἐπιδημιῶν Γ.

Kuehlewein's text [is founded upon five codices, as follows:—First, the oldest and most precious of the Hippocratic manuscripts, that of Vienna on vellum, of the tenth century. Secondly and about equal to it in importance, the Parisian MS. No. 2253; it is on vellum and of the eleventh century. Thirdly, the Laurentian in Florence, a vellum manuscript of the eleventh to twelfth century, brought from Constantinople. Fourthly, the Marcianum, in St. Mark's at Venice, considered by Daremberg, if I remember a-right, to be of the same family as the Parisian No. 2253; and finally the Vatican MS. No. 276, of the twelfth century, the oldest of those which follow the Marcian. A facsimile of a page of the beautiful Parisian MS. No. 2253 is appended to the prolegomena; it is written in a beautiful

small hand and currently legible even by one unskilled in palaeography as myself. Omitting the secondary sources, which are carefully set forth by Ilberg, such are the foundations of the present edition. Whether the editor regards it as a complete variorum edition of the great Ionian I scarcely know, as but one volume is before me; in this volume the alternative readings often go beyond the primary sources, and appear to be drawn from a wide comparison of texts. No doubt the editor has used a good deal of discrimination in his notes, and has taken care not to allow any material variations to escape record. This edition of the text then is of great literary importance; forasmuch as the Ionic style of Hippocrates is not that of Herodotus, and his writings, apart from their essential merits, are thus of primary importance in constructing a standard of the Ionic dialect. The editor does not touch upon this interesting subject; probably because he has to restrict his excursus on account of the handy size of his edition. In like manner he has not entered, thus far at any rate, into the difficulties of the canon. For this I can forgive him; as there remains but little to say that has not been said again and again by other commentators. I think that it was Dr. Greenhill who used to tell the story of a certain list which contained those books of the corpus which were regarded by English scholars as the *probably* authentic; but by equally eminent continental scholars as a list of the books certainly *not* by Hippocrates! As matters now stand attributions vary in the mouths of various teachers from a short list of some half dozen books to twice the number. I dare say the contrast could be made even more divergent than this: argument on the subject is virtually exhausted unless some fresh evidence turn up.

On the other hand I think that too much is made of the uncertainty of attributions. Whosoever were the author of this book of the canon or of that, it is clear that all the books are ancient. I do not now refer to Egyptian origins but to Greek work of the great time, and before it. The collection moreover consists almost entirely of Ionic records, though Chidian books are mixed with Coan: this being so, and for other reasons of an internal as well as of a historical kind, it seems probable that the Hippocratic scriptures may date back as a whole to a time before Aristotle. The canon is almost certainly pre-Alexandrian. Thus although, after the fashion of early times, there are many works in the collection

written in the name of the Master, yet there is none which is of the nature of forgery or of pastiche. All of them, whether rough notes or more finished treatises, are serious documents; and the collection is a genuine one throughout. This opinion is founded upon the similarity of dialect pervading the whole corpus, upon the borrowings and quotations which the authors mutually owe to each other, upon the elevation of manners, and upon the clear-sighted aversion from mysticism on the one hand, and from speculative philosophy on the other, which is notable throughout. In some of the books we find a lofty simplicity of style which gives them a place in fine letters; in others the style, rugged in its veracity and directness, still claims a position of its own in literature: nor is this spirit absent from any of the books, though none of them shows any pretensions to literary art, and many indeed are little or nothing more than the notes of disciples. We know but too well how ready medicine has always been, not perhaps to lose its ethical tone, but to fall under the tyranny of formulas, or into the toils of metaphysical systems; but such an 'alacrity of sinking' is not manifest even in the rudest of the Hippocratic books. The editor does not prefix any argument to the several books; a great want in a working edition of the canon: but this edition is evidently intended to be a handy variorum edition for daily use, and all such additional matter is perhaps forbidden. Littré's volumes are much more cumbersome. No more then is provided than the soundest text yet published, with indication of the sources and variants: the number of volumes to come is not mentioned. For a comparative study of the several books, from the historical, medical or literary points of view, the student must still depend upon Littré.

The admirable English edition of Hippocrates by Adams, published by the Sydenham Society in 1849, an edition professing to be confined to the 'authentic works' but happily going much beyond its promise, (for well equipped as Adams was in all other respects he was not severely critical in respect of authenticity) has made us in England independent of other translations. At the same time we welcome the first instalment of what will prove to be the standard translation into German by the competent hand of Dr. Fuchs. The volume is handsome in form and well printed in roman type. I cannot pretend to have done more than sample the workmanship by taking passages here and there for purposes

of comparison; nor can I pretend to the grammatical scholarship which would make my opinion a valuable one in this respect; but I may be permitted to say that the translation is very readable, and that in substance it is careful and close to the text. Of its accuracy in the finer grammar, I leave others to speak; but meanwhile I have no hesitation in saying that Dr. Fuchs' rendering of this important body of doctrine and literature is a valuable and a faithful one. It is to be hoped that this translation, with that of Adams, will be the means of spreading the knowledge of the Hippocratic writings beyond the circle of professed scholars; and may lead to a better knowledge of one of the finest spirits in the history of scientific discovery, of the emancipation of the human mind, and of the devotion of man's faculties to the solace of his kind. The translator has added some notes to the text which are brief and to the point; but there are no excursus or other essays. As the work is handsome in form, I think that these omissions are to be regretted on behalf of the ordinary reader; perhaps a supplementary critical volume will be issued. The volume now issued contains neither index nor even table of contents.

The last work on my list is a very interesting essay on the Glossary of Erotian by Johannes Ilberg, whose prolegomena to Kuehlewein's edition of Hippocrates are reviewed above. Erotian's glossary to the Hippocratean writings is invaluable as a clue to their interpretation. Ilberg does not tell us whether Erotian was grammarian or physician; probably because he knows no more of him than the rest of us who only recognise in him one of the best of the Alexandrian school of grammarians. First printed by Stephens the glossary, which formed the basis of the excellent commentary of Foësius in his classical edition of the Hippocratean treatises, was published separately by him at Frankfort in 1588 under the name of the *Oeconomia* of Hippocrates; and it is still indispensable to students of the Collection.

Most unfortunately the early editors of Erotian's glossary have so tampered with its form that much of its value is lost, in part probably for ever. It is as a contribu-

tion to the reconstruction of the glossary in its original form that Ilberg has published this communication in the *Transactions* from which it is separately reprinted. I may perhaps here supplement Ilberg's essay by saying that Erotian was living, probably at Rome, in the reign of Nero. His list of the canon contains some titles of works of the school which are lost; on the other hand some titles of extant works are omitted.

There is little doubt that the explanatory matter was originally written as a commentary upon the margins of Erotian's copy of the Hippocratic collection. Then came a clumsy digester of these notes who reduced the matter into alphabetical order, but did not give himself the trouble to retain the textual references. He was followed by other blunderers of the same kind. Thus, unless in the case of *ἀπαξ ἐρρήμμενα*, the commentary retains but a restricted value, and is almost useless in respect of recensions. For instance, if certain words of Erotian can definitely be restored to the *Περὶ ἀέρων, ἰδάρων, τόπων*, lost portions of value referring to Egypt and Lybia can be saved. How by the comparison of scholia, and especially of certain marginal notes in the Vatican Library, subsequent editors have endeavoured to restore the original form of Erotian's glossary as a running commentary, I must leave the reader to learn from the orderly exposition of Herr Ilberg; the chapter is well worth reading as an example of scholarly ingenuity and industry. In his second chapter Ilberg discusses generally the scholia of Hippocrates and their sources. He observes that the most difficult task in this study is to trace out the influence of Galen upon the Hippocratic tradition: that Galen's school has left decided traces upon our manuscripts is certain. The list of genuine books as accepted by Erotian is discussed by Ilberg, and is shown, as we might expect, to have but a relative value.

Ilberg concludes his interesting essay with the words that 'Auf Grund unserer Untersuchung wird es nunmehr möglich sein, bei weitem den grössten Theil der Erotianischen Glossen mit dem Ursprungszeugniss zu versehen.'

T. CLIFFORD ALLBUTT.

THE BATRACHOMACHIA.

Die homerische Batrachomachia des Karers Pigres nebst Scholien und Paraphrase.
Herausgegeben und erläutert von ARTHUR
LUDWICH. Leipzig, Teubner. 1896. M. 20.¹

JUSTICE cannot be done to this monument of learning in the limits of a review. The pretty poem of 303 lines in which the fates of the Frogs and Mice are recounted is furnished with 483 pages of evidence and and illustration by Prof. Ludwig of Königsberg, who thus makes a most weighty addition to his long list of services to Homer.² The editor tells us that it is thirty years since he began to collect material, and he arranges beneath his text the testimony of no less than seventy-four MSS. Prolegomena, 140 pp. long and divided into 40 chapters, precede the text: it is followed by 109 pages of practically unedited scholia, 10 of paraphrase, 106 of commentary, and the book ends with two indices verborum, one containing the vocabulary of the poem, the other that of the scholia, the latter of which, as the author says, will be useful to the next editor of Du Cange.

I will briefly summarise the prolegomena. § 1 'Thiersage' and § 2 'Thierepos' treat in an interesting way and with breadth of erudition the relation of the Batr. to the same or similar generic compositions in Greek or Northern literatures; § 3 accumulates and discusses the evidence for the title, which Ludwig fixes as *βατραχομαχία*, to the omission of *-μνο-*; §§ 4-6 settle the age and authorship of the poem. The traditional ascription to Pigres, brother of the Queen of Halicarnassus who made herself a name at Salamis is supported by

¹ I take this opportunity—as I am not likely to publish anything on the Homeric Hymns for some months to come—to make an observation or two on the interesting discussion that has been going on in these pages.

I regret that Prof. Tyrrell (Feb., p. 28) thinks that no one shares his confidence in the soundness of his *εσοο*, Herm. 33. The Oxford editors did what they could in this sense by printing it and *καὶ ἥδιον* also (Dem. 12) in their text.

Mr. Agar's pious prayer (p. 31) has been heard. I do not rely on Mr. Platt's metrical canon. But the 'analogical but unauthenticated' *ὑνεαρ* is likely to appear in the next Oxford edition unless in the meantime Mr. Agar provides something better than *ὑνεαρ καὶ πολὺ χάρις*. A place will be found for *οὐδέ σε λήσσει*, Apoll. 53.

² The edition absorbs L.'s Königsberg programmes on the same subject, 1894.

NO. XCV. VOL. XI.

the language of the poem, and by the comparison of the parodic epic literature from Hipponax downwards, of which the chief representatives are the fourth and third century gastronomic writers Matro and Archestratus. These form a *terminus ad quem*, in contrast to which the style of the Batr. (when purged of its Byzantine accretions) suits well with the literary circle of Panyasis and Herodotus. This date appears so secure that I cannot but think the attempt on p. 21 to connect the epithet *μνομαχία* in Plutarch with *μύειν* and *μυστική σωτή* supersubtle. §§ 7-9 contain many just and acute observations on the literary nature and intention of the poem; much sound and moderate criticism will be found therein. § 10 accumulates evidence to shew how completely the Batr., though in its origin a pure *παίγνιον*, became a Byzantine schoolbook. The extraordinary abundance of MSS. from the 10th to the 16th centuries, the unwonted and astonishing wealth of alternatives (both of words and of lines), and the purely didactic character of much of the scholia, to say nothing of the innocent and mildly moral tendency of the verses themselves, amply demonstrate this. The Batr. in fact was the most popular and widely-read member of the series of Constantinopolitan schoolbooks, which included the Prometheus Vincens, the Electra, the Hecuba and Phoenix, the Plutus, bits of Pindar and Theocritus, and the early books of the *Iliad*. Had not the Turk stepped in to arrest, and printing to eternise, this development, these few specimens would have been all that the western world knew of Hellenic verse.

§ 11 enumerates 74 manuscripts, of which four, Barocci 50 (this is perhaps X—XI.), Laur. XXXII. 3 (C of the *Iliad*), Paris suppl. grec. 690, and Escorialensis Ω. I. 12 belong to the 11th century. Of the rest two are of the 12th, four of the 13th, nine of the 14th, two 14th—15th, some forty-five of the 15th, the remainder of the 16th. § 13—§ 34 are taken up with the establishment of classes and families among this crowd of documents; I have read them with lively interest and admiration. They are a model of patient and rigorous method. To the truth of conclusions like these naturally no testimony of value can be given except by those who have gone through the same process as the author, and this perhaps a

reviewer may be excused. Prof. Ludwig (p. 56) arranges his troop into 4 classes, which contain respectively 4, 3, 3 and 2 families; the representatives of the 1st class are Barocci 50, and Paris suppl. 690; of the 4th, the Florentine and Escorial MSS., while the 2nd and 3rd classes contain principally late copies. The editor believes in the goodness of the older MSS. rather than the younger (and here I imagine most readers will agree with him); of classes 4 and 1 he prefers the 1st, and throughout his text pays deference to the evidence of Barocci 50—a beautifully-written book, which contains mainly grammatical treatises utilised by Cramer in his *Anec. Ox.* but also a quantity of minor Greek verse, among which it is to be regretted that Pindar, Theocritus and the Homeric Hymns do not find a place.

These sections contain a great deal of most interesting matter bearing upon the peculiarities of the text of the *Batr.*, which only long familiarity with the documents would qualify a reviewer to appraise. I may be permitted to mention the more general qualities of impartiality, objectivity and moderation, as distinguishing the investigation from most others of the same sort. A modified eclecticism is the editor's principle, and no other, it appears to me, unless under exceptional circumstances, is reasonable. The accidents of time and circumstance are so incalculable that to regard one family or one MS. as the depository of all truth is to sacrifice the facts to 'method.' § 34—§ 38 treat the scholia, paraphrase and glosses, over which great labour has been spent. § 39 describes the archetype of the existing MSS. as the editor represents it to himself. He carries back with some probability the Byzantine text, in its main features, to the time of Alciphron and Herodian the grammarian.

The constitution of the text of the *Batr.* is a very interesting question. The editor remarks with justice that there 'existirt ausser ihr kein anderes griechisches Gedicht von ebenso mässigem Umfang mit ebenso übermässiger Verunstaltung.' The variants are of the most bewildering sort and unite every known category of corruption. Mr. Platt who has somewhere called the MSS. of the Homeric Hymns 'shameful,' would be at a loss for parliamentary language in which to express his opinion of the tradition of the *Batr.* It occupies a position halfway between the other Homeric poems; the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* enjoy a more abundant tradition, but their variants are controlled

by the extensive and explicit information that we possess upon the Alexandrine and pre-Alexandrine text; the Hymns are like the *Batr.* in their neglect by classical antiquity, but their tradition is scanty and there are no signs that Byzantine instructors added largely to their bulk. The very number of lines of the *Batr.* varies materially in different copies. A well-thumbed school-book, extensively reproduced by the publishing trade, of naturally ambiguous semi-epic style, it offered uncommon facilities for addition and alteration. The separation of these later additions from the original stock forms the principal task of criticism on the *Batr.* The editor with characteristic modesty prints two columns of text; in the former he puts the traditional readings selected from the MSS. mostly, though not invariably, according to the canons of their goodness already ascertained; in the second, his own reconstruction of their common archetype. It is not to be supposed, nor does the editor anticipate, that this reconstruction will satisfy the learned public in all points. Indeed failing papyrus, our only friend, these ancient documents will remain to the end of time things on which we must agree to differ. Meanwhile for critics other than 'brilliant,' the one profitable principle is to abstain from conjectures that are imperatively ruled out by the elementary conditions of palaeography.

To criticise half the sore places in the *Batr.* would need a separate treatise. I must content myself with noticing a few points in the first hundred lines. V. 1. ἀρχόμενος πρώτον μουσῶν χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος codd. πρώτης σελίδος Z. I cannot think πρώτης σελίδος original: the word is not cited earlier than Posidippus, it is peculiar to Z, and seems more natural to a schoolboy than a poet. Perhaps it was invented to meet the difficulty of ἀρχόμενος πρώτον. V. 3. ἦν νεὸν ἐν δέλτοις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα. L's alteration of θῆκα into θήσω seems unnecessary: the poet lays his theme upon his knee and asks for inspiration. The scholiast's paraphrase is substantially right, ἦν ἐν ταῖς βίβλοις ἐγγράφων καὶ χαράττων δηλονότι ἔθηκα ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς γούνασιν. νεόν is adv. V. 8 ὡς λόγος ἐν θνητοῖσιν ἐστὶν τοίην δ' ἔχον [ἔχεν or ἔσχεν plerique] ἀρχήν. One of L's suggestions, τοιῇ δ' ἔχεν ἀρχή, occurred to me, cl. h. Apoll. 228 ἀλλ' ἔχεν ὕλην. (Barnes for ὕλην) Φ 177 τρις δὲ μεθέηκε βίην (βίης βίην βίην), but the vulg. suffices. V. 20 ἠριδανοῖο, ὠκεανοῖο. The same variant II 151, where it may receive some confirmation from this parody. Vv. 23, 24 σκηπ-

τοῦχον βασιλῆα καὶ ἐν πολέμοισι μαχητὴν | ἐμμεναι. ἀλλ' ἄγε θάσσον ἐὼν γενεὴν ἀγόρευε
om. Oxf. Rom. Par.² (three families of the same class). The lines are unnecessary it is true, but not on that account late; they belong to the commonest category of epic variant, the dispensable supplement. ἐὼν = σὴν is not conclusive; Aeschylus uses ἐαυτοῦ &c. for the second person, and in the loss of serious epic literature between the Hymns and Alexandria it is impossible to say that Panyasis and Antimachus may not have used ἐὼς = σός. 25. τίπτει γένος τοῦμὸν ζητεῖς; the variants on the rest of the line seem to point to a pair of readings φίλε δῆλον ἄπασι, and τὸ δὲ δῆλον ἄπασι. Z has τὸ δ' ἄσσημον ἄπασι, from which I hardly think L. right in deducing εὔσσημον ἄπασι. The permutation of *a* and the ligature *eu* is usually confined to late minuscules, and Z is not far from the uncial limit. 30. γείνατο δ' ἐν Καλίβῃ με καὶ ἔρριψε νέμεσθαι Z, ἐξέθρεψατο βρωτοῖς cet. Accepting Z's reading I prefer L's earlier conj. εἰσέρριψε (why not ἐξέρριψε?) to his later invention ἐκρυψ' ἐννεμέθεσθαι. 36. ἔχων πολὺ σισαμόντυρον. I agree with L. in printing this; the alternative, the unmetrical πολλὴν σισαμίδα, is the gloss on it, accepted by the same Byzantines to whom the following passage is due. 42-52 om. ZII. The view to be taken of these vv. is of vital consequence to the Batr. as a whole. The editor while lending weight to their omission by his best family, still regards them as ancient, part perhaps of another poem of Pigres (!), and accordingly rewrites the lines which betray the worst metrical faults. I cannot but think this a mistaken policy. (1) There is no homeoteleuton, homearchon or other paleographical condition to explain their omission in ZII; the presumption is therefore that they are an addition in the other MSS. (2) In purport they are not contemptible, but I presume that it was not beyond the powers of Byzantines of the IXth century to compose additions to a fable of this sort;

putting such additions into good hexameters would have been the difficulty. (3) There is no reason why these lines should have undergone more metrical corruption than the rest. To say they resided on a margin and therefore (though why?) were damaged, is to beg the question. Such lines as οὐδέ ποτε πολέμοιο κακὴν ἀπέφυγον ἀντήν, νήδυμος οὐκ ἀπέφυγεν ὕπνος δάκνοντος ἐμεῖο, ἀνθρώπων οὐ δέδια καίπερ μέγα σῶμα φοροῦντα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λέκτρον ἰὼν ἄκρὸν δάκτυλὸν δάκνω are such as would have been composed by learned men acquainted with the epic dialect but who had lost the sense of quantitative metre. They remind me of the gems of the Periochae to the books of the *Iliad*, Ζῆτα δ' ἱρεῖ ἐκάβη ἀθηνᾶς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκεν, πὶ πάτροκλος πέφνε σάρπηδόνα καὶ θάνεν αὐτός, ῥῶ δαναοὶ τρώες τε ἄμφι νέκυν περιμάχοντο, &c.; and it seems a mistake to rearrange them into ἀπέφευγον ἀντήν, νήδυμος οὐκ ἀπέφευγε πόνος, οὐ δέδια ἄνθρωπον, ἔδακον κατὰ δάκτυλον ἄκρον. Similarly at 113 sq., 210 sq., and elsewhere I am not clear as to the reasons that impel the editor to reject some alternative lines, and to keep others equally unmusical, doctoring them into metre. Another point where I find myself at variance with the learned editor is the expedient of transposition, which he employs largely, 65 sq., 184 sq., and elsewhere. The question is thorny; I must content myself with expressing my belief that MSS. as we know them were not largely liable to this source of corruption; nor do I agree with the editor's theory [p. 102] that lines originally omitted and added on a margin, got into a wrong place in the text of the next copy.

The edition it need hardly be said surpasses its predecessors, Baumeister, Abel and Brandt, in which we were accustomed to read the *Batrachomachia*. At the same time whatever is of value in them and the earlier editions is presented here: in few modern books is so much justice done to the past.

THOMAS W. ALLEN.

POSTGATE'S EDITION OF THE SEVENTH BOOK OF LUCAN.

M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili, Liber VII. With introduction, notes and critical appendix by J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D. Cambridge, University Press, 1896. 2s.

To those who wish to be introduced to the peculiar style of this poet, at once so

attractive for his brilliancy of epigram, and so disappointing for his shallow soullessness and redundant rhetoric, this book will be of the utmost service. The historical introduction gives a full and vivid account of the battle of Pharsalia, based on a comparison of the ancient authorities. The exact learning and conciseness of the notes leave

little to be desired; perhaps the great difficulty of Lucan, the difficulty of following his connexion and appreciating his bold expressions, might have been met better by introducing rather more translation and curtailing the comments. But the work is the loving work of a scholar who has much to teach. I offer with diffidence some suggestions towards improvements in the next edition.

Line 28 *unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam*? would be best explained by a translation: 'how couldst thou, Pompey, have slumbers like the multitude and a night of joy?' Cp. Hor. *Sat.* 2, 5, 102 *unde mihi tam fortem tamque fidelem*? In the next line *si te uel sic tua Roma uideret* is passed over. I think *uel sic* refers to *funestas acies* 27 and it means 'O happy, if thy Rome had seen thee even defeated,' whereas, in fact, Pompey never returned to Rome. L. 93 *labor belli* = μάχης πόνος *Il.* 16, 568, and has no reference to "the exceedingly toilsome character of Roman warfare." *Labor* in this sense belongs to the epic vocabulary: Verg. *Aen.* 2, 619 *finemque inpono labori*: 12, 727 *quem damnet labor*. L. 162 *signa uix reuolsa solo* is probably a reminiscence of Liv. 22, 3, § 12 *nuntiatur signum omni ui moliente signifero conuelli nequire*: 1. 165 *fugit ab ara taurus* of Liv. 21, 63, § 13 *inmolantique ei uitulus iam ictus e manibus sacrificantium sese cum proripuisse*. L. 268 "*nilil esse recuso*, i.e. I am prepared to be anything," hardly brings out the point. Rather 'there is nought (hateful) that I refuse to be,' explained by the following words *inuidia regnate mea*. L. 273 *non illa* from the note might be inferred to be a mannerism of Horace and Vergil; but it is of general occurrence, cp. Liv. 22, 5, § 7 *non illa ordinata per principes*. L. 287 *ensem* is the 'sword,' not the "sword stroke," as *lancea* is the lance in the next line. Here again Lucan is probably thinking of Livy 21, 43, § 17. I have often wondered that Lucan's careful study of Livy has received so little attention. L. 320 *dum tela micant* requires explanation: it means 'while darts fly to and fro:' Liv. 6, 12, § 9 *tum micent gladii*: 21, 7, § 8 *non pro moenibus modo atque turri tela micare*. Verg. *Aen.* 10, 396 *semanimesque micant digiti*. L. 325 *ignoti ingulum tamquam scelus inputet hostis*: the note is long and obscure, and leaves me in doubt as to the meaning, which I take to be: 'Mar with the sword faces you should respect, whether it be that a man shall advance with ravening steel against his kinsfolks' breasts, or shall disfigure no dear one with his sword; he

should regard it as a crime to slay a stranger foeman.' The troops are to kill Italians only, whether related to them or not: non-Italian combatants are to be disregarded. The subject to *inputet* is supplied from *quis*: the meaning of *pignus*, a relation, common in Ovid, might have been illustrated. L. 395 *nocte coacta*, a night 'forced upon him,' is erroneously illustrated from Ov. *Trist.* 4, 10, 35 *clauī mensura coacta est*, which, of course, means 'the size of my stripe was curtailed,' i.e. I wore the *angustus clauus*. L. 414: on *laturos* it is said that "the fut. part. in poets often appears to differ little from a present:" this seems doubtful; at any rate here *laturos* = 'ready to hurl.'

The critical appendix, the materials of which are taken almost entirely from Hosius, invites consideration, as Dr. Postgate has produced an independent text. I assign a very high value to M, the Montepessulanus, which, though not always right, is generally superior to the other MSS., and which is sometimes unwisely deserted by Dr. Postgate. Francken's edition containing the Ashburnham MS. contains only books I.—V.

The following changes are improvements: 130 *mortis uenturaest* (*uentura est* M): 179 *defunctosque ululare patres et sanguinis umbras* for *defunctosque patres et cunctas sanguinis umbras*. 575 *confundere* (for *contundere*) *uoltus* restored from V. 622 *ore quis aduerso demissum faucibus ensem expulerit moriens anima*: for *moriens, animam* restored from U. 658 *uoluitque* (for *uoluitque*) *sui solacia casus*.

It is clear that our MSS. descend from two or more archetypes: therefore omissions such as line 90 by MB, line 257, found only in G mvbe, and 796, omitted by MGU, do not seem to me to throw any doubt on the genuineness of these lines, but prove that the exemplar copied was in those places damaged or illegible: the dislocations at 488-521, where the new order adopted by Dr. Postgate seems very probable, indicate that this kind of fault existed early in the MSS.

In the following passages the text seems to be questionable: 180 *dementibus unum hoc solamen erat*: here *dementibus* is the editor's emendation for *sed mentibus*, which is, I think, sound: 'still this was the only consolation to their hearts,' i.e. though frightened by spectres they take an insane pleasure in horrors.

262 *gladioque exsoluite culpam* (from G) for *gladiosque exsoluite culpa* (M), i.e. 'free yourselves from guilt by the sword' instead

of 'free your swords from guilt,' i.e. by victory, seems doubtful, as the next line *nulla manus belli mutato iudice pura est* seems intended to explain the meaning. Why should Dr. Postgate desert M for G here, when he rejects 257-258 because they are contained in G but not in M? Again in 286 he adopts *quarum* from BCU instead of the quite simple *quorum* of MGv, thus abandoning both the excellent M and his new ally G.

303 *poena paratur* BEUG is rightly read for *poena parata* M. It might have been pointed out that the mistake of M is due to the tendency of MSS. to assimilate terminations, e.g. 309 where M has *fodientia* (for *fodientem*) *uiscera* on account of *uiscera*: so 1, 435 *canas* (for *cana*) *pendentes rupe Cebennas*: 2, 51 *non adliget Hister, fundet* etc. (for *fundat*): 2, 155 *praecipiti iuculatus pondere duro* (for *dura*) *dissiluit percussus humo* (error due to *pondere*).

334-335 *si totidem Magni soceros totidemque petentes urbis regna suas funesto in Marte locasset*, the conjecture of Grotius *locasset* is adopted for *locasset* MSS., "for Lucan would not have said 'si Caesar in Marte locasset totidem Caesares' (*Magni soceros*), and he has just told us Caesar did not arrange his men." But Hosius is right in keeping *locasset*: the meaning is 'If Caesar had (which he did not do) arranged so many Caesars.' The subjunctive mood shows this. And *locasset*, which must be addressed to the reader, is awkwardly abrupt.

504-505 *nec Fortuna diu rerum tot pondera uertens abstulit ingentis futo torrente ruinas* means 'and Chance who was overthrowing so many weighty interests did not long withhold the dire downfall whirled on by destiny.' The text is quite sound: the very abundance of measures proposed for its reformation in the note makes them improbable.

522 *tenet obliquas post terga cohortes* means Caesar keeps six cohorts behind in reserve. *Tenet* does not require alteration, such as *ciet* proposed.

587 *quid ferrum, Brute, tenebas* so Postgate following Hosius reads from a lost Hamburg MS. *quod ferrum* MSS. 'what sort of a sword were you wielding' is certainly weak.

Perhaps *quoi* (*cui*) should be read: 'against whom,' i.e. Caesar (dat. *incommodi*).

625 *quis cruor e scissis perruperit aera uenis inque hostis cadat arma sui*. Here *e scissis* is the editor's conjecture for *emissis* MSS. But *emissis* seems to me unquestionably right; though *uenis* does not then mean 'blood,' as Dr. Postgate says, but 'veins': translate 'whose blood has dashed through the air when the veins have been loosened (opened) and falls on the arms of its enemy.' *Quis*, I think, is not nom. but dat. pl.: *emissis uenis* is a bold variation on such a phrase as *sanguine uenis emissio* Plin. H. N. 25, 23, § 56. With similar boldness in 735 *aut Marte subactis* means not 'conquered' but 'exhausted' by war i. q. *confectis*. To read *ac Marte peractis* is to rewrite Lucan.

I take this opportunity of offering the following suggestions.

140 *tunc omnes lancea saxo erigitur* MSS. has no satisfactory meaning. Read *exigitur* 'is tested': Cic. in Verr. 2, 1, § 133 *ad perpendicularum columnas exigere* (Postgate's *corrigitur* is rather violent).

156 *et trabibus mixtis auidos typhonas aquarum detulit* (*pytonas* BM) so Hosius and Postgate: but *typhonas* seems to have to do with fire not water. The conjecture *siphonas* (Grotius) seems to have been a reading known to the scholiast: I think it is right, and means 'water spouts.' See Munro's note on Aetna 327.

462. Here the MSS. vary greatly, the Palatine palimpsest of the fourth century has *vvltyvqvoxo* the rest of the line being lost. M has apparently *tempus quo noscere possent* and so V. Read *uultu quoque noscere tempus, facturi quas monstra forent*. *Possent* seems to be a gloss intended to explain the absence of the verb. (Postgate's *uultusque ac noscere tempus* is harsh in sound.)

I have noticed the following misprints: p. 67 three lines from the bottom *reflexion* for *reflexion*: p. 68, line 1 *pellets* should, I think, be *bullets*, at least the latter word would be happier: p. 76, note on 676 *sq.*, *desired* should be *denied*: p. 94 note on 462-3, 'he does not quote 462' should be '463.'

S. G. OWEN.

HAUVETTE ON THE EPIGRAMS OF SIMONIDES.

De l'Authenticité des Épigrammes de Simonide,
par AMÉDÉE HAUVETTE. (Bibliothèque de
la Faculté des Lettres de Paris); Paris.
1896. 5 Fr.

THE aim of the writer of this book is to determine, by a detailed examination of all the epigrams attributed to Simonides, in which we may recognise the genuine work of that poet. To this end M. Hauvette gives us first a 'critical examination of the sources' i.e. of all the ancient authors (in historical sequence) who preserve the epigrams assigned to Simonides, and afterwards a collection of the epigrams themselves, with a copious commentary. Twenty are selected as being, beyond reasonable doubt, authentic, while the remainder are weighed in the balance with regard to the merits of each individual case. In twenty-one cases the judgment of M. Hauvette is in favour of admitting the genuineness of the epigram. Thus we have forty-one epigrams in all whose authenticity is admitted, against sixty condemned—forty-nine with some hesitation, eleven without discussion.

Now it may be granted that the ultimate aim of criticism is to separate the genuine work of Simonides from that which falsely bears his name: but opinions may differ as to the means to be employed to this end. Surely the first task of the critic should be to form a clear idea of the literary history of Simonides' epigrams—the date at which a collection first appeared in book-form bearing his name, the contents of that collection, and its subsequent history. For this purpose we must be ready, if necessary, to draw analogies from similar collections ascribed to other poets—in other words, it is necessary to study the history of the epigram as a literary 'genre' among the Greeks, in order to approach the special problem offered by Simonides. M. Hauvette's attitude towards these questions does not seem to be altogether satisfactory. The first section of his work does indeed present itself as in some sort an effort to reconstruct the literary history of the Simonidean collection. Such a collection, says the author, was used by Chamaeleon, if not by Aristotle. Portions of it were incorporated into the *Στίχωνος* of Meleager, and have thus been in part transmitted to us through the anthologies of Cephalas and Planudes. But it would seem (although M. Hauvette leaves

this to the inference of the reader) that the original collection was little read in later antiquity: for the quotations of Plutarch, the Pseudo-Dion, Pausanias and Aristides are not to be regarded as drawn from the collection itself, but from other sources. Grammarians, however, such as Herodian, and metrical writers like Hephaestion, still drew upon the 'authorised edition.' If we inquire, however, on what grounds it is maintained that some quotations are drawn from the collected epigrams, while others are not, we cannot help suspecting M. Hauvette of a tendency to assume that which stands in need of proof, viz. that the collection which is on p. 22 expressly affirmed to be pre-Alexandrine (as against Weisshäupl), but notwithstanding seems afterwards to be spoken of as 'the Alexandrine collection' (cf. pp. 27, 30), was, on the whole, free from epigrams falsely attributed to Simonides. Now it seems clear (1) that the collection of epigrams assigned to Simonides was already in existence at the beginning of the Alexandrine period, (2) that it contained epigrams often copied from existing monuments, but assigned, without evidence, and even contrary to evidence, to Simonides. Had M. Hauvette consulted the pages which Reitzenstein (*Epigramm und Skolion* 107 ff.) has devoted to the question—it does not appear that the work was before him—he might have abandoned the *parti pris* which makes him careful of questioning the Alexandrine tradition. While much that is put forward by Reitzenstein must be discounted as pure hypothesis—e.g. the 'Peloponnesian recension' of Simonides—he has at least made it plain that the 'Simonides' presupposed by the Alexandrines and the Anthology is essentially of the same order as the 'Anakreon' and even the 'Archilochos' of the same tradition. Just as *A.P.* vi. 138, (attributed to Anacreon), has come to light as a genuine Attic inscription half a century later than the time of the poet (*C.I.A.* i. 381), so, e.g. Simonides 188 Bergk (rejected without discussion by Hauvette on the ground of its date) was a genuine inscription, seen at Olympia by Pausanias, and even M. Hauvette does not venture to deny that Hephaestion drew it from the 'recueil alexandrin': but such errors, he says, were the exception, not the rule. Without presuming to determine in what proportion

the true and the false were mingled in that collection, we may assert that it was in all likelihood neither worse, nor much better, than those ascribed to other poets. In this connection a fuller treatment of that most interesting document, *A.P.* xiii. 28 (Hauvette, No. 83), would have been desirable. Besides the lemma *Βακχυλίδου ἢ Σιμωνίδου* of the Palatine MS. we have a *probable* reference in Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. *Ἀκαμαντίον* to the authorship of Simonides. What the poem really is, has been shown by Wilamowitz in a brilliant article (*Hermes* xx. 68 ff.) to which M. Hauvette makes no reference. Again, the significance of the variants in the tradition of the famous epigram on the tomb of the Spartans at Thermopylae does not seem to have been grasped by M. Hauvette. The form *πειθόμενοι νομίμοις* is found in all the authors, beginning with Lycurgus (the *Anthology* excepted), who quote the epigram. Herodotus, however, gives the genuine *ρήμασι πειθόμενοι*. Instead of accepting the simple inference that the doctored text circulated in the time of Lycurgus, M. Hauvette makes the complicated assumption that the correction was perhaps made on the marble, either through inadvertence or by intention, and thence transferred to later collections (p. 42 f.). Once more: the famous epigram *Ἑλλήνων προμαχοῦντες κ.τ.λ.* is cited by Lycurgus with the pentameter *χρυσόφορων Μήδων ἐστόρεσαν δύναμιν*: Aristides and later authorities give *ἔκτειναν Μήδων ἐννέα* (or even *εἴκοσι*) *μυριάδας*. M. Hauvette is at pains to show (in Part I.) that Aristides had no edition of Simonides before him; he therefore (p. 72) says that the inscription may very well have been quoted by Aristides from a corrupt text of Lycurgus. Manifestly Aristides is quoting from a 'doctored' edition of the poems of Simonides.

Enough has been said to show that M. Hauvette does not seem to have solved, or even to have grasped, the preliminary problems which beset the literary history of 'Simonides.' His discussions of individual epigrams will be read with interest, and are

less open to criticism. A firmer hand in dealing with the dialectic forms might be desired. For example, in No. 3, where *τέτορες* is preserved by metre and *Πελοποννήσου* by one family of the MSS. of Herodotus, it seems beneath the dignity of criticism to invoke Diodorus (wrongly), Aristides, and the *Anthology* in favour of retaining the Ionic colouring of the hexameter. As to the genuineness of particular epigrams, it is not likely that any editor will succeed in establishing an unquestioned series of judgments. Many will be disposed to question the authenticity even of some poems which appear among the twenty 'épigrammes authentiques' of M. Hauvette, e.g. the epitaph on the dog Lycas (No. 5), which seems to be a literary exercise of the class brought into fashion by Anyte. Others may refuse to see in the silence of Plutarch a reason for condemning the couplet inscribed by the Corinthian trierarch Diodorus on the spoils consecrated after Salamis (No. 63), while No. 62 (Bergk 101, attributed to Simonides in the *Anthology* and by the Scholiast on Aristides) belongs to the more favoured category. The criteria laid down by M. Hauvette are at times somewhat rigidly applied; it is no doubt characteristic of the best attested four-line epigrams of Simonides that the two couplets are independent in sense, but there is no reason to think that Simonides would not have broken the rule, and we can scarcely use the argument, e.g. against No. 47, where M. Hauvette has mistaken the sense of the opening words, evidently a reminiscence of the Homeric *ὄλος καὶ Κένταυρον* (φ 295). But it may be questioned whether a somewhat *a priori* discussion of each epigram does much to increase our certainty as to the genuine work of Simonides. A clearer conception of the history of the epigram in Greek literature, and a more searching analysis of the earlier collections embodied in the *Στίχωνος* of Meleager are needed, before individual epigrams will fall into their proper places.

H. STUART JONES.

ARCHAEOLOGY.

THE ORIGIN OF MONEY.

Les Origines de la Monnaie. ERNEST BABELON. Paris, Didot. 1897. Fr. 3.50.

SOME of M. Babelon's best work has been concerned with the early monetary issues of Asia. It is therefore with satisfaction that we greet an exposition of his views in regard to the origin of coin. No one has a better right to be heard in the matter.

A great part of the work before us does not come into the field to which the *Classical Review* is confined. M. Babelon discusses many economic questions as to the function of money and its working. He also speaks of the systems of barter in use in primitive societies, of hatchets, caldrons and bars of metal which passed as a measure of value, and a medium of exchange. Into these fields I shall not follow him. My observations will be limited to the two subjects of the origin of money in Greece and Asia, and the character of the earliest issues in electrum, chapters 3 and 7.

The most original and important chapter of M. Babelon's book is the third. Hitherto two views have been current in regard to the question who first issued money; the common view, which regards it as having been first struck by authority of states and cities, and the view of Prof. Ernst Curtius, that the first issues were those of temples. M. Babelon seeks to establish a third view. He thinks that between the circulation of bars and rings of fixed weight and the rise of the regular state coinages of Greece there intervened a time when currency was mainly in the form of coin, but coin issued by private bankers, rather than by any civic or religious authority. It is to the *τραπεζίτης* that he assigns the honour of the invention of money. This earliest specie is largely represented in our collections; it consists mainly of beans or pellets of electrum indented with punch-marks, but not usually bearing stamps which can be assigned to particular cities. After a time the untrustworthiness of these private issues, and the impurity of their metal caused them to be superseded by state coinages, by that of Croesus in Lydia, and by that of Pheidon and other innovators in Greece proper.

Such is M. Babelon's view. He does not seriously attempt to prove it: perhaps in the nature of the case proof is impossible.

But he tries to render it probable by various arguments. Perhaps his strongest point is analogy. He shows that in many countries private issues of money have preceded or supplemented those which are public, in China, in India, in Russia, and elsewhere. It is impossible to say that some of the early electrum coin of the Ionic coast cannot have had this character. And it seems natural that bankers who dealt with large quantities of precious metal should have divided up the bars of gold and electrum into pieces of convenient size, and guaranteed their weight by a well known mark.

At the same time, when one passes from the inherent probability of M. Babelon's view, to the particular form in which he states it, one is obliged to take some exception. The early coins of Phocaea (type, a seal), and of Cyzicus (type, a tunny), have on the reverse punch-marks of irregular form. M. Babelon thinks that these were not state issues, but struck by bankers at Phocaea and Cyzicus respectively, the punch-mark being the stamp of the banker himself. This seems very improbable. The well-known coin which bears the name of Phanes and the type of a stag is regarded by M. Babelon as struck at Ephesus by a banker named Phanes. This is even more unlikely. The stag, according to the inscription, is the sign or mark of Phanes: it cannot at the same time prove the coin to belong to Ephesus. As the coin in question was found at Halicarnassus, and as the only Phanes known to history was a prominent Halicarnassian of the time of Cambyses, it seems unnecessary to seek for it another place of issue than the city of Herodotus.

M. Babelon is also not always in accord with the evidence in sketching the early history of the electrum coinage. It is true that the very early issues of electrum are most irregular as to the proportion of gold to silver which they contain. But the regular civic issues of a somewhat later date are in this matter not much more trustworthy. The experiments of Mr. Head, and my own, (*Numismatic Chronicle*, 1887) have shown that from first to last the composition of electrum coins is in the highest degree irregular: but that in the average of cases, the value of them compared with pure gold is so low as to render exceedingly improbable the view of Brandis, that they passed at three-

fourths of the value of gold. This latter view M. Babelon accepts (p. 318). At the same time however he accepts another view scarcely consistent with it, that the Daric and the Cyzicene stater (nearly double its weight) were of equal value. However, details apart, we may welcome M. Babelon's theory as to private issues of coin, and bear it in mind in our future researches.

Many readers of the *Classical Review* will be interested to see how M. Babelon treats a well-known passage of Herodotus; *Ἀνδοί . . . πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων, τῶν ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν, νόμισμα χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου κοινόμενοι ἐχρήσαντο* (I. 94). Here, following the lead of M. Six, M. Babelon regards the words of Herodotus as applying to the issues of Croesus which were the earliest or among the earliest issues in pure gold and silver: he rejects the view that Herodotus is thinking of electrum money; and regards our early electrum coins as not Lydian, but belonging to the Ionian cities. 'Ne serait-il pas étrange, qu' Hérodote, qui partout distingue avec tant de soin l'*electrum* ou l'*or blanc* de l'*or proprement dit*, eût, dans cette seule circonstance, désigné l'*electrum* simplement par le mot *χρυσός*?' The observation of M. Six is very acute: but its conclusiveness may be disputed. Nor is M. Babelon's statement quite exact. What Herodotus distinguishes are *χρυσός λευκός* and *χρυσός ἀπρόχθος*: both alike he classes as gold; and when, as in i. 94, he speaks merely of *χρυσός*, he may mean either. Taking the statement of Herodotus then in conjunction with the statement of Xenophanes of Colophon who lived as early as the sixth century, and who regards the Lydians as the first to issue coin, we may still I think regard at least some of the earliest electrum as money of the Lydian kings. And certainly there is nothing in the coins themselves inconsistent with such a view.

We will consider only one other point, M. Babelon's view of Pheidon, and his monetary reforms. The date of Pheidon is a matter as to which our evidence is conflicting: but his connexion with the early money of Peloponnesus seems almost certain. M. Babelon speaks of Pheidon in one place (p. 213) as the propagator, not the inventor, of coinage of Aeginetan type: and indeed his connexion with Aegina is brought into doubt. In another place (p. 370) Pheidon is mentioned as the creator of the new system of silver money. Again M. Babelon accepts (p. 330) Prof. Ridgeway's view that the weight of the Aeginetan silver stater was fixed at 195 grains in order that ten of these staters should pass for one gold stater of 130 grains, gold being

fifteen times as valuable as silver. But at the same time he admits (p. 370) that the Aeginetan standard of weight had been in use for other metals before it was applied to the silver coin. 'Pheidon donna le nom d'obole au petit poids d'argent dont la valeur correspondait à celle du lingot de fer appelé ὀβολός, et qui pesait une mine.' It seems impossible that the weight of the Aeginetan drachm can have been decided by reference to a gold currency, and the weight of the obolus (or sixth of a drachm) by reference to an iron currency. The two views are alternatives, and cannot both be maintained.

Thus it appears that M. Babelon's views on early coinage cannot be accepted without modifications. But all that we can fairly expect in matters of such intricacy and obscurity is that each new writer will make some useful addition to our fabric of knowledge: and this M. Babelon has done.

As I proposed at first, I have dealt only with one or two chapters of M. Babelon's work. It contains much of interest in other directions. The writer tells us that it was originally intended for lectures, like its prototype, Lenormant's *Monnaie dans l'Antiquité*. It is not easy to follow a man like M. Lenormant: but M. Babelon does not suffer from comparison with his predecessor. Less brilliant in conjecture, he is more trustworthy in execution; and he attains with Lenormant something of the highest merit which a writer who is not exhaustive can claim, that of being suggestive.

PERCY GARDNER.

MONTHLY RECORD.

GREECE.

Athens.—Important discoveries have been made in the rocks on the north-west slope of the Acropolis by the Greek Archaeological Society. Inscriptions have been found which show that what was hitherto supposed to be the grotto of Pan must rather belong to Apollo Hypakraios; they were found on ten marble tablets let into the rock, giving the names of the *ἔρχων βασιλεῖς* and *θεσμοθέται* for the year, which enables them to be dated. Before the grotto is a quadrilateral sinking in the rock in which probably stood the altar mentioned by Euripides (*Ion*, 938). Further to the east were found a series of steps hewn in the rock, and connecting with those found in 1886 inside the Acropolis. They were probably the stairs used by the Arrhephoroi.^{1 2}

In the neighbourhood of the Areopagus the German Archaeological Institute has found a fragment of the rim of a large black-glazed vessel, incised with a sharp tool with the words *Θεμιστοκλῆς Φρεδάρβιος* in archaic characters. This is obviously

¹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 13 Feb.

² *Ibid.* 27 Feb.

an ἱστρακον used for the banishment of the great Themistokles in 470 B.C. Other ἱστρακα are known with the names of Megakles and Xanthippos.¹

Peiraeus.—The site hitherto thought to be the Serangeion has been shown by the investigations of Svoronos to belong to the epoch of the Minyae. This and the adjacent heroon belonged to the cult of Euphamos, who is identical with the sea-god Glaukos. In the Serangeion is a mosaic with representation of Glaukos in pursuit of Scylla.²

Salamis.—An inscription has come to light with two lines of an epitaph on Corinthians who fell in the great battle. The dialect is Doric, the alphabet Corinthian. The words imply that the Corinthians arrogated to themselves a large share in the victory.³

Delphi.—A new inscription which has been found

is interesting in connection with the history of Thrace. It is a ψήφισμα recording the granting of a *προξενία*, and giving the names of four sons of Chersobleptes, the king of Thrace who is mentioned by Demosthenes (*Phil.* iv. § 133). Three of the names are purely Greek. Another inscription has been found on a column with statue erected by the people of Delphi to M. Minucius Quintus, who defeated an incursion of the Gauls into Greece.

The theatre has now been entirely laid bare. It is in close proximity to the peribolos of the temple of Apollo, and is fully preserved. There are seven *κεκλιδές*, each with thirty-three rows of seats. On the lower row are inscriptions relating to manumissions and decrees of *προξενία*.³

H. B. WALTERS.

¹ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 27 Feb.

² *Ibid.* 13 Feb.

³ *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 27 Feb.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

American Journal of Philology. Vol. xvii. 3. Whole No. 67. Oct. 1896.

Some General Problems of Ablaut, C. D. Buck. A consideration of certain facts with a view to the best practical arrangement of an ablaut-system. *The Authorship of the Dialogus de Oratoribus*, R. B. Steele. Who the writer was cannot be determined, unless there may be found in some work of a later writer a direct quotation assigned to its author. Against Pliny and Quintilian, as well as Tacitus, the negative argument is conclusive. That he was a rhetorician is shown by the prevailing schoolish tone of the work. *The Dramatic Synchoregia at Athens*, E. Capps. In 406 a law was passed providing for the conjunction of two citizens in the tragic and comic choregia for the City Dionysia. Between 399 and 394 this law was repealed for tragedy, while for comedy the synchoregia was retained, and before 388 the number of comedies to be presented was increased to five. This arrangement lasted until about 340, when the old usage was re-established. *The More Complicated Figures of Comparison in Plato*, G. B. Hussey. Some of the comparisons that are confused or distorted are treated of; similar irregularities are grouped together and the causes of their confusion discussed; the structure of certain larger groups of comparisons is explained in detail. *Notes on the Historical Syntax of Quamvis*, H. D. Wild. The usage is overwhelmingly in favour of the subj. with *quamvis*. The pres. is used in considerably more than one-half of the subj. instances, a predominance due to the present tense in the second half of the compound. There is a note by E. W. Fay referring to a criticism of his essay on 'Agglutination and Adaptation' by Prof. Victor Henry. The following books are reviewed—Usener's *Götternamen: Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung*—Leo's *Plauti Comediarum et Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*—Shuckburgh's *C. Suetonii Tranquilli Divus Augustus*.

Revue de Philologie. Vol. xx. Part 4. Oct. 1896.

Inventaire sommaire des textes grecs classiques retrouvés sur papyrus, P. Couvreur. *Vitruvius Rufus*, P. Tannery. The edition of Cantor in his *Die römischen Agrimensoren* (1875) is here referred to. In § 39 for the corrupt *plictum cum cacum* it is

proposed to read *cacumen perlustratum cum oculo*. *Phaedr.* L. Havet. Notes on iii. Prol. 38 (iii. epil. 14); 15, 20; epil. 2; v. 5, 11–12 (and i. 29, 3); append. 6, 6. *Térence*, *Eun.* 588, A. Macé. Conjectures *hiemem* for *codd. hominem*. *Notes critiques*, O. Keller. Notes on (1) *Anecdota Bernensia*, ed. Hagen, p. 187, (2) *Alexand. Aphrodis.*, problem. 2, 16, (3) *Orosius*, vii. 9, 14. *Phèdre*, iv. 9, 2, J. Chauvin. Reads *reperire effugium allerius succurrit malo*.

Vol. xxi. Part 1. Jan. 1897.

Deux papyrus grecs du British Museum, F. G. Kenyon. (1) Fragment of a *Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτεία* (?). (2) Fragment on the right of requisition in Roman Egypt. *Note sur le papyrus CLXXXVII. du British Museum*, B. Haussoullier. Agrees with Mr. Kenyon that in the former of the two fragments above named we have a reference to Spartan institutions. *Servire*, R. Pichon. Two curious uses of this word in Seneca noticed. *Les Théâtres de Rome au temps de Plaute et de Térence*, P. Fabia. (1) Attempts to show that Rome had theatres with seats at latest towards the middle of the sixth cent. A.U.C. (2) Restores some verses to Plaut, which had been attributed to some obscure writers. *Remarques sur le texte de l'histoire de Créens dans Hérodote*, E. Tournier. *Nouvelles notes critiques sur le texte de Tacite*, L. Constans. Various passages in the *Agricola* and the *Annals* noticed. *Quinte-Curce*, III. l. 11, J. Keilhoff. Reads *quae continenti adheret, sed quia magna ex parte etc.* *Dèmes et tribus, patries et phratries de Milet*, B. Haussoullier. Information gathered from all the published inscriptions. *Un nouveau manuscrit des lettres de Sénèque dispersé entre Leyde et Oxford*, E. Chatelain. These letters are found up to 7, 2, in *Vossianus* F. 70, 1 at Leyden, and the rest in *Canonicius* Lat. class. 279 at Oxford. The writing of the two MSS. is the same and of the tenth century. *Notes sur Thucydide*, E. Chambry. On various passages in Books I.–IV. *Mis, tis, honoris gratia (causa)*, L. Havet. Remarks that in several passages of Plautus if we replace *mei* (*mihī*), *tui*, by *mis*, *tis*, respectively, the Plautine genitive of *ego* and *tu*, we restore the metre. *τδ μη et τοδ μη, question à propos d'Hérodote* I. 86, E. Tournier. Must we not here read *τδ μη κατακαυθῆναι*, for *τοδ μη* would give the opposite sense? *Sur un passage de Phèdre*, L. Duvau. In

iv. 9, 2, instead of M. Chauvin's correction in the last no., suggests *repente effugium quaerit alterius malo*.

Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik. Vol. 153. Part 12. 1896.

Verschollene Länder des Altertums, VI., K. Krauth. On the eastern tax-districts of Persia according to Herodotus and the Darius-inscriptions. *Zur Ilias*, R. Gaede. Maintains the authenticity of Σ 243-313. *Der froschmäusekrieg bei Plutarch*, A. Gercke. Does not agree with Ludwig in his explanation of the two passages in Plutarch referring to this poem, which cannot be identified with the one we possess of this name. *Die Phoinissai des Euripides*, P. Voigt. It was the aim of Eur. to counsel the utmost self-sacrifice on the part of the Athenians in their struggle with Sparta. *Zu Catullus*, L. Polster. In 64, 108, 109 reads *illa procul radicitus extirpata | prona cedit late, dumetis obvia frangens*, and in 96, *4 mistas* for *missas*. *Der wert des codex Gyraldinus für die kritik des Aetna*, L. Altzinger. This codex is played out as the 'best source.' For the foundation of the text we must have recourse to CS. (Cantabrigiensis and fragmentum Stabulense). *Zu Horatius*, E. Schweikert. In Od. ii. 17, 25 alters the punctuation by putting a colon at *alas*, and a comma only at *sonum* in the next line. *Zu Livius*

Andronicus, J. Tolkiehn. On a passage of Nonius in which a tragedy under the title of *Equos Trojanus* is ascribed to Livius.

Vol. 155. Part 1. 1897.

Das Schlachtfeld im Teutoburger Walde, I, A. Wilms. A criticism on Knoke's view that the last camp of the Romans is to be found in the Habichtswald [see Cl. Rev. X. 407]. *Epigraphisches*, W. Schwarz. On two Egyptian inscriptions. *Zu Sophokles Aias*, C. Conradt. Elucidations of various difficult passages. *Zu Diophantos von Alexandria*, F. Hultsch. The dedication of D's ἀποστροφή contains part of two iambic lines. *Eine näherungsrechnung der alten poliorketiker*, F. Hultsch. Explains Polybius ix. 12 foll. by reference to Heron's *μετρίδιον*. *Die Arvalbrüder*, E. Hoffmann. A criticism of Wissowa's article *Arvales fratres* in the new edition of Pauly. *Zu Vergilius Aeneis*, Ph. Loewe. In ii. 117 suggests *tendistis* for the text *venistis*. *Vertistis* has also been suggested. *De actorum in fabulis Terentianis numero et ordine*, M. Hodermann. *Zu Tacitus*, L. Polster. Critical notes on Hist. i. 52, i. 58, iv. 15, Ann. i. 35, and Germ. 29. *Die sechzehnte epode des Horatius*, Th. Plüss. Without the contradictions in this poem, it might be a masterpiece, and it is not, as Kiessling thinks, the work of a beginner.

LIST OF NEW BOOKS.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN BOOKS.

- Allcroft* (A. H.) and J. H. Haydon, *History of Rome*, 31B. C.-96A. D.: the Early Principate. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 270 pp. (Univ. Tut. Ser.) Clive. 2s. 6d.
- Aristophanes*. The Knights, adapted for performance by the Oxford Univ. Dramatic Society 1897. With English version adapted from that of J. H. Freere by L. E. Berman. 8vo. Frowde. 2s.
- Aristotle*. Nicomachean Ethics, Books I.-V. (except 1, § 6) X, §§ 6-9. Translated by St. G. Stock. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 116 pp. Oxford, Blackwell. 4s. 6d.
- Caesar*. Gallic war, book VI. With introduction and notes by J. Brown. 12mo. 106 pp. Blackie. 1s. 6d.
- Euripides*. Alcestis, literally translated from Paley's text by H. Sharpley. Crown 8vo. 54 pp. Simpkins. 1s. 6d.

- Greek Papyri Series. Ser. II. New classical fragments and other Greek and Latin papyri. Edited by B. F. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. 4to. Frowde. 12s. 6d.
- Hardmann* (W. M.) and A. S. Walpole, Latin exercises for lower School Forms. 12mo. 184 pp. Longmans. 2s.
- Harrison* (Jane E.) Greek Art. Introductory studies. 4th Ed. 8vo. 324 pp., map, engravings. Unwin. 7s. 6d.
- Hoppin* (J. M.) Greek art on Greek soil. 8vo. viii, 254 pp., engravings. Boston. \$2.
- Xenophon*. Anabasis, Book I. Edited with introduction, Vocabulary, Translation by A. H. Allcroft and F. L. D. Richardson. 2nd Ed. Crown 8vo. 152 pp. Clive. 3s.

FOREIGN BOOKS.

- Apuleii* (Lucii) *Metamorphoseon libri XI*. Recensuit J. van der Vliet. 12 mo. xxix, 292 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Aristoteles*. *Ethique à Nicomaque*, Livre X. avec des notes par G. Rodier. 8vo. 152 pp. Paris, Delagrave.
- Barthélemy-Saint-Hilaire* (J.) *Socrate et Platon ou le Platonisme*. 8vo. 57. Chartres.
- Cicero*. Zielinski (Th.) *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*. Ein Vortrag. iv, 102 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.

- Corpus inscriptionum atticarum, consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editum*. Appendix. *Defixionum tabellae atticae* ed. R. Wuensch. Folio. xxxii, 52 pp. Berlin, Reimer. 9 Mk.
- Curtius* (E.) und J. A. Kauper, *Karten von Attika*. Pt. 9. Uebersichts-oder Gesamt-Karte von Attika. 9 sheets, 2 suppl. sheets, Title page. With Index. Fasc. 1. 4 sheets. 24 × 45, 5 ctm. Berlin, Reimer. 6 Mk. 40.
- Friedersdorf* (Fz.) *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*.

- 2nd Ed., with collaboration of H. Begemann. 8vo. vii, 204 pp. Berlin, Dümmler. 1 Mk. 80.
- Heraclides*. Voss (O.) De Heraclidis Pontici vita et scriptis. 8vo. 95 pp. Rostock. 2 Mk.
- Homerus*. Gedichte. B. II. Ilias. Kommentar von O. Henke. 8vo. iii, 329 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk. 40.
- Hultsch* (Fr.) Poseidonius und die Grösse und Entfernung der Sonne. 4to. 48 pp., engravings. Berlin, Weidmann. 3 Mk.
- (Abhdlgn. der kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. New Series. Vol. I. Nr. 5).
- Ludwich* (A.) Kritische Miscellen I–XI. 4to. 20 pp. Königsberg. 60 Pf.
- Platon's Phaedon. Mit Einleitung und Commentar von J. Stender. 8vo. x, 182 pp. Halle, Waisenhans. 1 Mk. 50.
- Plato*. Dümmler (F.) Zur Composition des platonischen Staates mit einem Excurs über die Entwicklung der platonischen Psychologie. 4to. 34 pp. Basel.
- Krieg (M.) Die Uebersetzung der Platonischen Gesetze durch Philipp v. Opus. 8vo. 40 pp. Freiburg, Herder. 1 Mk. 20.
- Plinii Secundi* (C.) Naturalis historia, post Lud. Jani obitum recogn. et auxit C. Mayhoff. Vol. IV. (Libri 23–30.) 12mo. x, 500 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 6 Mk.
- Plutarchi Moralia, recogn. G. N. Bernardakis. Vol. VII. Plutarchi fragmenta vera et spuria continens. 12mo. lvi, 544 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- the same. Epilogus. 12mo. 47 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 Mk.
- Prosopographia imperii romani saec. I. II. III. edita consilio et auctoritate academiae scientiarum regiae borussicae. (In 4 partibus.) Pars I. Edidit E. Klebs. ix, 489 pp. Pars II. Ed. H. Dessau. v, 443 pp. Royal 8vo. Berlin, Reimer. 44 Mk.
- Rehm* (A.) Mythographische Untersuchungen über griechische Sternsagen. 8vo. 50 pp. München.
- Reiske* (Joh. Jac.) Briefe, herausgegeben von Rich. Foerster. 8vo. xvi, 928 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 30 Mk.
- (Abhandlungen der philol.-historischen Klasse der k. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Vol. 16.)
- Reitzenstein* (R.) Geschichte der griechischen Etymologika. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Philologie in Alexandria und Byzanz. 8vo. ix, 408 pp., 2 plates. Leipzig, Teubner. 18 Mk.
- Ridder* (A. de.) De ectypis quibusdam aeneis quae falso vocantur 'argivocorinthiaca.' 8vo. 93 pp. Paris.
- De l'idée de la mort en Grèce à l'époque classique. 8vo. viii, 204 pp. Paris, Fontemoing.
- Scenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta, tertiis curis recogn. O. Ribbeck. 12mo. viii, 335 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 Mk.
- Schmid* (G.) De Archestrati Gelensis et Qu. Ennii fragmentis quibusdam. 8vo. 19 pp. St. Petersburg, Ricker. 1 Mk. 50.
- Schneidewin* (M.) Die antike Humanität. 8vo. xx, 558 pp. Berlin, Weidmann. 12 Mk.
- Sieckel* (Th. R. v.) Römische Berichte II. 8vo. 154 pp., 2 plates. Wien, Gerold. 3 Mk. 80.
- (Aus Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie d. W.)
- Sophocles*. Pichler (F.) Beiträge zur Ueberlieferung der Sophoklesscholien. 8vo. 12 pp. Graz.
- Vogl (F.) Beiträge zur Verständigung über Zahlensymmetrie und Responion im sophokleischen Drama. 8vo. 26 pp. Ungarisch-Hradisch.
- Stadtmüller* (H.) Zu einigen Grabschriften der Palatinischen Anthologie und ihren Verfassern. 4to. 15 pp. Heidelberg.
- Strack* (Max L.) Die Dynastie der Ptolemaeer. 8vo. xvi, 294 pp. Berlin, Besser. 7 Mk.
- Tacitus*. Strobl (A.) Zur Schullektüre der Annalen des Tacitus. 8vo. 38 pp. Prag.
- Terentianus*. Werth (Alfr.) De Terentiani sermone et aetate. (Aus Jahrb. für class. Philol. Suppl. Vol. 23.) 8vo. 87 pp. Leipzig, Teubner. 3 Mk.
- Thomas* (E.) Rome et l'Empire aux deux premiers siècles de notre ère. 12mo. xii, 348 pp. Hachette.
- Urbanus Bellunensis*. Hilgard (A.) Des Urbanus von Belluno Institutionum in linguam Graecam grammaticarum libro duo. 4to. 6 pp. Heidelberg.
- Varro*. Agahd (R.) De Varronis Rerum Divinarum libris I. XIV. XV. XVI. ab Augustino in libris de civitate dei IV. VI. VII. excerptis. 8vo. 38 pp. Leipzig.
- Vergil*. Cartault (A.) Etude sur les Bucoliques de Virgile. 8vo. 507 pp. Paris, Colin. 5 Fr.
- Hunziker (R.) Die Figur der Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils. Mit einer einleitenden Untersuchung über Wesen und Einteilung der Hyperbel. 8vo. iv, 163 pp. Zürich.
- Verrius Flaccus*. Mackensen (L.) De Verri Flacci libris orthographicis. 8vo. 62 pp. Jena.
- Vitkau* (J.) Etude sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui de Septante. 8vo. v, 330 pp. Paris, Bouillon.
- Vitruvius*. Krohn (F.) Quaestiones Vitruvianae. Particula I. De M. Ceti Faventini epitoma. 8vo. 43 pp. Berlin, Mayer and M. 1 Mk. 20.
- Wachsmuth* (Curt.) Neue Beiträge zur Topographie von Athen. 8vo. 56 pp. Leipzig, Hirzel. 3 Mk.
- (Aus 'Abhandlungen der k. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften.')
- Wolfflin* (E. v.) Epigraphische Beiträge II. 8vo. 28 pp. München.